LAW REVERSIONARY INTEREST SOCIETY, LIMITED.
24, LINCOLN'S INN FIELDS, W.C.
ESTABLISHED 1853.
Capital £400,000
Debentures and Debenture Stock £208,130
REVERSIONS BOUGHT. LOANS MADE THEREON.
Proposal Forms and full information may be had at the Society's Offices.
W. OSCAR NASH, F.I.A., *Actuary and Secretary.*

REEVES & TURNER,
LAW BOOKSELLERS AND PUBLISHERS.
LIBRARIES VALUED OR PURCHASED.
A Large Stock of Second-hand Reports and Text-Books always on Sale.
3, BREAM'S BUILDINGS, CHANCERY LANE, E.C.
FORMERLY OF 100, CHANCERY LANE AND CAREY STREET.

THE LAW GUARANTEE AND TRUST SOCIETY, LIMITED,
FULLY SUBSCRIBED CAPITAL - - £2,000,000
PAID-UP AND ON CALL - - - - £200,000
RESERVES - - - - - - - £180,000
FIDELITY GUARANTEES OF ALL KINDS. ADMINISTRATION AND LUNACY BONDS. MORTGAGE, DEBENTURE, LICENSE, AND CONTINGENCY INSURANCE. TRUSTEESHIPS FOR DEBENTURE-HOLDERS, &C.
HEAD OFFICE: 49, Chancery-lane, W.C. | CITY OFFICE: 56, Moorgate-street, E.C.

X *IMPORTANT TO SOLICITORS* X
In Drawing LEASES or MORTGAGES of
LICENSED PROPERTY
To see that the Insurance Covenants include a policy covering the risk of LOSS OR FORFEITURE OF THE LICENSE.
Suitable clauses, settled by Counsel, can be obtained on application to
THE LICENSES INSURANCE CORPORATION AND GUARANTEE FUND, LIMITED,
24, MOORGATE STREET, LONDON, E.C.
Mortgages Guaranteed on Licensed Properties promptly, without special valuation and at low rates.

LEGAL AND GENERAL LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY.
ESTABLISHED 1836.
FUNDS - - - - - £3,900,000
INCOME - - - - - £467,000
YEARLY BUSINESS (1901) - £1,663,159
BUSINESS IN FORCE - - £13,900,000
THE PERFECTED SYSTEM of Life Assurance is peculiar to this Society and embraces every modern advantage.
PERFECTED MAXIMUM POLICIES.
WITHOUT PROFITS.
The Rates for these Whole Life Policies are very moderate.

Age	Premium	Age	Premium	Age	Premium
20	£1 7 8 %	30	£1 16 %	40	£2 10 %

£1,000 POLICY WITH BONUSES
According to last results.
Valuation at 2½ p.c. :—Hm. Table of Mortality.

Duration	10 yrs.	20 yrs.	30 yrs.	40 yrs.
Amount of Policy	£1,199	£1,488	£1,724	£2,067

Full information on application to
THE MANAGER, 10, FLEET STREET, LONDON.

VOL. XLVI., No. 49.
The Solicitors' Journal and Reporter.
LONDON, OCTOBER 4, 1902.

*** The Editor cannot undertake to return rejected contributions, and copies should be kept of all articles sent by writers who are not on the regular staff of the JOURNAL.

All letters intended for publication in the SOLICITORS' JOURNAL must be authenticated by the name of the writer.

Contents.

CURRENT TOPICS 781
THE LIVERPOOL COURT OF PASSAGE ... 783
A READING OF THE NEW STATUTES... 784
REVIEWS 785
CORRESPONDENCE 785
NEW ORDERS, &C. 785
LAW SOCIETIES 786
THE GOWN QUESTION 786
THE MILWARD CASE 787
CONCERNING PROFESSIONAL CRIMINALS 788
LEGAL NEWS 789
WINDING UP NOTICES 790
CREDITORS' NOTICES 790
BANKRUPTCY NOTICES 791

CURRENT TOPICS.

YET ANOTHER holiday appears to be in prospect for the learned judges of the Supreme Court, just when they will have returned to their work rosy and vigorous after their vacation. The Royal procession has been fixed for the 25th inst.; the streets will be impassable, and it may probably be anticipated that the Lord Chancellor will direct the closing of the courts on that day. If so, the result will be that the work of the judges will practically recommence on the 27th, instead of the 24th, inst.

THE GOWN question at the Brentford County Court is, it appears, to be submitted to a plebiscite of the practitioners in that court. The judge is reported to have stated on Friday in last week that if the practice was inconvenient or burdensome to them, or they wished to have it abolished, it should cease with that sitting of the court. We may be permitted to point out that this evades the real question raised by the proceedings of the judge at the previous sitting. It is not at all whether gowns are desired by solicitors, but whether the judge has any right to refuse to hear a solicitor who appears without robes. We say he is not justified in doing so, and it would appear that even the judge has his doubts on the subject, since he is reported to have remarked that "if the case of any ungowned advocate were called on, the worst that could happen would be its being passed over till he got a gown or borrowed one—a matter of not the slightest difficulty and of frequent occurrence; that the case would then, on application made, be reinstated and heard, and no loss beyond a brief delay could happen to any client whose advocate did not wilfully and wantonly refuse to comply with the easy practice of the court." But this still amounts to saying that if a solicitor should refuse to borrow a gown or could not get a gown lent, his case would not be heard. This would be a very serious piece of injustice, and we trust that any ungowned solicitor who is refused a hearing on this ground will take the opinion of the King's Bench Division upon the subject. The judge's tirade about "deference to or defiance of lawful authority" in relation to breach of the "rule" relative to the wearing of gowns, begs the whole question, which is whether he has any power to make such a rule and to enforce it by refusal to hear the ungowned advocate.

IT IS so much a matter of course in England that trust money cannot be invested on a second mortgage that it is at first a little startling to find the propriety of such a mortgage discussed in the recent case of *Chapman* v. *Browne* (1902, 1 Ch. 785). In fact, however, the mortgage there in question was on lands in Ireland, and the Irish Registration Acts, and the practice in that country as to enforcing mortgages, render a second mortgage a less hazardous security than with us. Under a power for trustees of a settlement to invest in real securities in England or Ireland, a sum of £17,900

(reduced by subsequent payments to £12,150), was invested on mortgage of lands which were already subject to mortgages for £4,700 and £2,400. Of course the risk of a second mortgagee lies in the fact that the mortgagee does not obtain the legal estate, and is consequently liable to be postponed to a subsequent incumbrancer who is fortunate enough to get this in; and, moreover, if the first mortgagee calls in his money, the second mortgagee may be foreclosed if he has not the means to redeem the first mortgage. Under the Irish system of registration there is, it seems, no danger of a subsequent mortgagee obtaining priority by means of the legal estate, and under the Irish practice the court does not allow the first mortgagee to foreclose, but effects a sale in the interest of all parties. Hence it has been held in Ireland that a loan of trust money on second mortgage is not in itself a breach of trust: see *Crampton* v. *Walker* (31 L. R. Ir. 427). In the present case ROMER, L.J., who delivered the judgment of the Court of Appeal, pointed out that the objections to second mortgages are not based solely on the risk of tacking and the liability to foreclosure, and in particular the second mortgagee is liable to have the fund available for payment of interest taken entirely by the first mortgagee. There were, however, other circumstances which made the investment an improper one, and in the result it was unnecessary to determine the abstract question, whether a second mortgage on land in Ireland made with trust money is in itself a breach of trust.

THE DECISION of FARWELL, J., in *Re Chenoweth* (50 W. R. 663; 1902, 2 Ch. 488) went, to a considerable extent, upon the peculiarity of gavelkind tenure, that where it prevails it is the common law of the country and not merely a custom which displaces the common law. Consequently, it does not depend for its effect upon evidence in the same manner as a custom. "An ordinary custom," said the learned judge, "such as the custom of a manor, is a contravention of the common law. The custom has to be proved, and extends no further than the user of it which is proved," and he referred to the *dictum* of CROMPTON, J., in *Muggleton* v. *Barnett* (2 H. & N., p. 651), that "proof of a custom of descent, contrary to the course of the common law, prevailing in a nearer degree of consanguinity is no proof of such custom extending to a more remote degree." The custom of gavelkind, on the other hand, does not depend on proof of its extent, and when it has once been proved that gavelkind exists in respect of particular land, then for that land it is to all intents the common law; and, as with the common law, it is assumed that the judge knows it. In other words, he has to extract its nature and limits from such sources of authority as are open to all; and he cannot require special proof. In general the judge's knowledge of the law depends on his knowledge of the decisions of his predecessors. When there are no decisions the case is more difficult. "In order," said FARWELL, J., "to ascertain what is the common law when there are no decisions to guide the court, we have regard to the wisdom of our ancestors and to their view of the law." In the present case the question was whether under gavelkind tenure the division of the lands among collaterals is confined to brothers and their issue, or extends to collaterals of every degree, and in favour of the latter alternative there is undoubtedly very high authority. "The extension of the Kentish custom to collaterals of every degree," it is said in Robinson on Gavelkind (5th ed., by Elton, p. 93), "is proved partly by the generality of the language of the ancient records, which usually state that the lands are 'partible among the males' . . . and partly by the modern practice and the common reputation in the county that the custom extends to the most remote collateral degree." Mr. Justice FARWELL, accordingly, decided in favour of the generality of the rule as to the divisibility of lands held in gavelkind.

AN INTERESTING decision upon the meaning of the phrase "matters of practice and procedure" in section 1 (4) of the Judicature Act, 1894, was given in *Long* v. *Great Northern and City Railway Co.* (50 W. R. 402; 1902, 1 K. B. 813). That section, being designed to check interlocutory appeals, provided that in such matters every appeal from a judge should be to the Court of Appeal. In *Watson* v. *Petts* (37 W. R. 68; 1899, 1 Q. B. 54) it was held that the expression covered matters of practice and procedure in connection with a cause or matter in the High Court, but not a matter in which it was sought to prohibit a county court judge from exceeding his jurisdiction in his own court. In the present case, also, the proceedings had not originated in the High Court, and it was held that the jurisdiction of the Court of Appeal was equally excluded. On a claim to compensation arising out of the exercise of their statutory powers by the railway company, the claimant had given notice requiring that the amount of his claim should be settled by a jury. The company thereupon applied under section 41 of the Regulation of Railways Act, 1868 (31 & 32 Vict. c. 110), to have the trial taken before a judge of the High Court, and an order was made by BUCKNILL, J., to that effect. Upon an appeal by the claimant to the Court of Appeal, it was objected that the order appealed against was not a matter of practice and procedure within the meaning of the Judicature Act, 1894, and that the appeal should have been to the Divisional Court. The Court of Appeal acceded to the objection on the authority of *Watson* v. *Petts*, and held that they had no jurisdiction to hear the appeal. The decision seems to take a narrow view of the sub-section, and it is unfortunate that a provision, which is apparently clear in its terms, and which was enacted for the very purpose of simplifying procedure, should be made by restrictive construction a means of embarrassing litigants. In the present case, just as in *Watson* v. *Petts*, there was originally no matter pending in the High Court; but the case differs from *Watson* v. *Petts* in that, upon the application for a trial in the High Court being made, the matter was brought directly under the cognizance of the High Court. The particular case is concerned with a somewhat special branch of procedure, and it is not worth while to elaborate it. But it is permissible to take exception on general grounds to decisions which, without adequate purpose, restrict the beneficial effect of statutory provisions intended to simplify procedure.

THE RECENT decision of JOYCE, J., in *Pryce-Jones* v. *Williams* (50 W. R. 586; 1902, 2 Ch. 517) is of importance with reference to the extent to which the ordinary condition of sale as to the time for delivering requisitions is binding. In 1884 two leases had been granted to company A, and in the same year company B was formed to take over the whole assets of company A, but no formal assignment of the leases was ever made. The process was repeated in 1891, when the assets passed to company C, but again there was no assignment, and indeed an assignment would on this occasion have been inoperative. Company B had no legal estate to assign. Further devolutions of title took place, and ultimately the property was sold by order of the court, subject to a condition limiting the time for sending in requisitions. Company A had been dissolved soon after the sale of its effects to company B. The vendor delivered an abstract shewing the leases, but it was not till after the time limit had expired that the purchaser delivered requisitions asking that the assignments of the leases in 1884 and 1891 should be abstracted and produced. Was he still entitled to insist on the requisitions? The case is not altogether easy, for it is a recognized rule that the condition does not apply where the objection goes to the root of title (*Want* v. *Stallibrass*, L. R. 8 Ex. 175), and accordingly in *Re Tanqueray-Willaume and Landau* (20 Ch. D. 465), where executors were proposing to sell under a power which in fact they had not got, it was held that the purchaser might object, though out of time. The principle seems to be that the court will not allow the condition to be made use of to compel the purchaser to take the property without any title at all. The present case comes very near this, for in the absence of formal assignments the vendor had no legal estate in the leases which he could assign to the purchaser. On the dissolution of company A the leases vested, so JOYCE, J., held, in the Crown as *bona vacantia*. He held further, however, that an objection which the purchaser can take out of time must be strictly to the root of title—that is, to the commencement; and, if the abstract shews a good title at the beginning requisitions, in respect of any matters affecting the subsequent devolution must be made within the time limited. It is not clear that this is really the meaning

of the rule on which KAY, J., acted in *Re Tangueray-Willaume and Landau*, but in the present instance the purchaser does not seem to have been substantially injured. The lessor had all the time been receiving rent, so that the leasehold title was probably for practical purposes good, and if the legal estate was really wanted, it could doubtless be got in from the Crown.

THE Journal of the Society of Comparative Legislation for July, which has recently been issued, contains a somewhat ambitious scheme for converting the society into "a legal consultative council of the empire." The scheme is embodied in an address which was presented, with the approval of the executive committee of the society, to the colonial premiers when they were lately in England. After recapitulating the work which the society has already done in obtaining and diffusing a knowledge of the course of legislation in different countries, particularly in the various parts of the British Empire and in the United States, and noting that the Board of Trade has promised to contribute a sum to the funds of the society, it is suggested that a further development of the work of the society is both practicable and opportune in the direction of promoting uniformity of legislation. Among the particular suggestions made are included proposals that the society "might aid in assimilating and codifying large parts of the laws of the Empire; in realizing so far as is practicable its legal unity"; that "it might help to codify, so far as is practicable, the commercial law of the Empire—to give it that which is possessed by France, Germany, Italy, Holland, and, indeed, by most of the chief States of the world, including some with commercial interests far inferior to ours"; and that it might "confer and advise as to the form and methods of legislation in the United Kingdom, India, and the Colonies." The Imperial Legal Council thus suggested, with local legal councils throughout the Empire, are to be at once unpaid and unofficial. What the Colonial premiers had to say to the scheme we are not told. Probably it was too vast to be taken in and considered on the spot, and they may not have realized very distinctly what the Society of Comparative Legislation is. Mr. SAUNDERS in his letter to the *Times* a few days ago, while blessing the scheme, pointed out the difficulties inherent in assimilating such very different system of law as those prevailing even within Great Britain itself. While fully admitting the importance of promoting uniformity of law, and of facilitating access to the laws prevailing in different parts of the Empire, we must confess to a feeling that the society proposes to assume functions which it could not adequately discharge.

THE CURRENT number of the *Law Quarterly Review* contains an interesting article by Mr. ERNEST BOWEN-ROWLANDS on County Court Judges and their Jurisdiction. The writer contends that county court judges are not paid highly enough; that the courts are often ill-constructed—*e.g.*, that in the Westminster County Court "the barristers, witnesses, judge, and jury are cheek by jowl in a six-foot area, where it is impossible for counsel to deal effectively with a jury"; that without the consent of the judge no appeal whatever should be allowed; and that imprisonment for debt ought to be really abolished, as it is popularly supposed to have been abolished, more than thirty years ago, by the Debtors Act, 1869, which is entitled: "An Act for the Abolition of Imprisonment for Debt, for the Punishment of Fraudulent Debtors, and for Other Purposes." Upon the last point Mr. BOWEN-ROWLANDS is very emphatic. He writes: "A recently-retired and otherwise just judge was satisfied with the merest tittle of evidence as to means, and no amount of appealing could alter it. . . . I have heard a judge sentence a poor washerwoman who, according to her own account, which was not contradicted, had to support a sick husband and four infants on eleven shillings a week, to be imprisoned for one month for not paying a grocer's bill." There is a good deal to be said on the other side with regard to some of Mr. BOWEN-ROWLAND'S contentions.

IN HIS recently-published lectures on Contract of Sale of Goods, his Honour Judge WILLIS gives some amusing examples of the concrete way in which litigants in the county court unconsciously propound abstract rules of law. Rule 4 of section 18 of the Sale of Goods Act, 1893, gives the rule for the passing of the property in goods when they are delivered to the buyer "on approval" or "on sale or return." "I have heard a peasant," says the lecturer, "brought up in the Fens, when I have said 'What is your defence to this alleged sale of goods?' quickly reply, 'I had 'em on liking and did not like 'em.' The good man did not know that, in the language of codifiers, the goods had been delivered to him on sale or return." The next story relates to an "aged man of over four-score years," who in the course of his very concrete statement of the law as to representation at the time of sale—he had bought a cow with the assurance she was in calf—referred, we regret to say, to the learned judge as "the guv'nor here." Some county court judges have a strongly-developed scent for contempt of court. Judge WILLIS seems to be better employed in getting amusement out of his litigants, and in passing it on to those who are fortunate enough to hear him lecture.

THE LIVERPOOL COURT OF PASSAGE.

THE "Liverpool Solicitor" who a year ago, in the columns of the *Times*, called attention to the deadlock which has arisen between the authorities—the Lord Chancellor and the Rule Committee of the Supreme Court—and the various public bodies and private individuals interested in the Liverpool Court of Passage, has now returned to the subject, and in a lengthy letter to the same paper suggests that the continued delay is due to the fear that any increase in the efficiency of the local court will be obtained at the sacrifice of the business of the High Court and of the fees which the High Court procures for the Treasury. A charge so pointed will, we hope, elicit a definite reply from the proper quarter, but meanwhile it may be interesting to state, so far as we understand it, the circumstances of the difficulty which has arisen.

Logically it may be that there is no room in our legal system for courts intermediate between the county court and the High Court, and practically, no doubt, there would be no reason for their existence if those two courts adequately divided between them the civil business of large commercial centres. But in point of fact the jurisdiction of the county court is inconveniently limited, and the sittings of the High Court are—to put it mildly—not continuous. Hence Liverpool not unnaturally attaches great importance to its local court, which has a jurisdiction practically unlimited. The efficiency of a court, however, depends not only upon the extent of its jurisdiction, but upon the procedure by means of which that jurisdiction is exercised, and it is natural that the persons responsible for local courts should endeavour from time to time to improve their procedure so as to bring it into harmony with modern ideas as to the simplicity and celerity of judicial proceedings. That the High Court itself has attained to any very lofty ideal in these matters it would be rash to say. But at any rate a good deal of attention has been given in the last thirty years or so to its improvement, and changes which have been found salutary in one court may not unreasonably be expected to prove salutary in another of co-ordinate jurisdiction. Hence some years ago an attempt was made to give the Liverpool Court of Passage the benefit of the High Court procedure, and this resulted in the passing of the Liverpool Court of Passage Act, 1893.

The preamble to that Act contains a recital which in terms admits the claim of the local court to the benefits desired for it. "Whereas," so the Act runs, "the Court of Passage in the City of Liverpool is an ancient court of record for the trial of civil actions, and the usefulness of the court to suitors would be increased if the jurisdiction were better defined and *if the procedure of the High Court were made applicable to it*." The usefulness of the court to suitors is obviously the only object the Legislature would desire to attain, and hence these words are a Parliamentary declaration that the Court of Passage is entitled to have the benefit of the High Court procedure. There are naturally, however, details in the adaptation of the procedure of one court to another that require consideration, and the mode

which the Legislature adopted of carrying their wishes into effect is contained in section 8 of the Act. According to this, the presiding judge of the Court of Passage may, "by order under his hand, made with the concurrence of the authority for the time being empowered to make rules for the Supreme Court, adopt and apply to the Court of Passage all or any of the Rules of the Supreme Court, 1883, or any other rules and orders for the time being in force which regulate the practice and procedure of the High Court, with such modifications (if any) as the judge or authority aforesaid may think fit." The insertion of the words "if any" is not without significance. It was the desire at Liverpool to adopt the procedure of the High Court; the Legislature admitted the justice of the desire and intended to give effect to it; but it was thought possible that some modification might be necessary, and to meet this possibility the saving clause was inserted. It was, however, clearly not contemplated that the reform intended to be effected by the Act should be frustrated by the Rule Committee refusing in some essential point, and for reasons never suggested by the Legislature, to apply to the Court of Passage the procedure of the High Court.

But it seems that this is what has in fact been done. A set of rules, almost entirely framed from the rules of the High Court, was, we understand, forwarded from Liverpool in 1894 for the consideration of the Rule Committee. It was objected, however, that the registrar of a borough court should not be allowed to put in force order 14 unless there was a chance of a speedy appeal, and to meet the objection the assistance of the Legislature was again invoked. By section 2 of the Liverpool Court of Passage Act, 1896, it is provided that, upon the adoption for the Court of Passage of any rules of the High Court, an appeal from any order made under such rules by the registrar shall lie to the presiding judge; but if at the time when the appeal is ready for hearing the presiding judge is not sitting, the appeal may lie, under rules to be made for the purpose, to a judge of the High Court at chambers, sitting either in London or Liverpool. But the good intentions of the Legislature have once more been frustrated, and the powers given by the two Acts still remain unexercised.

The case is aggravated by the fact that the Rules of the Supreme Court would be no novelty as applied to the Court of Passage. In 1876 the judge of the Court of Passage, under the powers of the Court of Passage Procedure Act, 1873, adopted the provisions of the Judicature Acts and the rules made thereunder, including the procedure to obtain summary judgment under order 14, and Mr. ARTHUR S. MATHER, in his address at the annual general meeting of the Liverpool Law Society last November, pointed out that for nine years the court used the new procedure, until in 1885 WILLS, J., in an action tried before him, held that fresh legislation was necessary before the rules could be efficaciously adopted by the court. As we have stated above, this legislation has been secured, and it might have been supposed that it would be matter of course to give effect to it and to sanction the draft rules sent from Liverpool, with such further rules as may be necessary to regulate the right of appeal from orders of the registrar. But in spite of continual efforts made by the Liverpool Corporation, the Liverpool Law Society, and the Liverpool Chamber of Commerce, nothing has been done. For some years it was thought that the trouble about order 14 was the cause of the delay, and the Lord Chancellor is said to have stated to a deputation of these three bodies, which waited on him in February, 1899, "that the rules about which there was no disagreement should be passed without delay, and that their arguments respecting order 14 should be laid before the Rule Committee." But this statement did not result in any advancement of the matter, and it was still in *statu quo* when the Lord Chancellor received another deputation from the same bodies in April last.

On this occasion the Lord Chancellor appears to have put the objection to the application of the R. S. C. to the Liverpool Court of Passage on quite a different ground. It is no longer order 14 that is obnoxious, but the High Court and the Treasury are afraid of the rivalry of the local court. This statement is founded on an account, quoted by the correspondent of the *Times* referred to above, of the remarks made by the Lord Chancellor to the deputation. He felt, he is reported to have said, that the Court of Passage was a sort of rival to the High Court and the county court, and he did not see his way to allow the fees that at present went to the Imperial Exchequer to be diverted to the corporation. The corporation, it may be remarked, take the fees coming to the Court of Passage. So it seems that the suitors of the court are to be deprived of their rights because the Chancellor of the Exchequer, or the Lord Chancellor on his behalf, is afraid of losing some small sum. This is indeed a new version of the ancient rule that justice is not to be sold to any man. In principle it is a question whether court fees should be charged at all. It is a plausible argument that the administration of justice to all who have occasion to invoke the assistance of the courts is one of the services which the State is bound to render to its subjects. But here we have a State—or the responsible head of the judicial department of the State—so keen about securing to itself all possible fees that it will sacrifice the interests of suitors in order to prevent anything being diverted to a public body within the State. But the matter requires no comment. The Lord Chancellor is also reported to have expressed his objection to making any court for a special class of litigation; he did not like special judges; they must be all-round judges. The remarks do not seem to have been particularly pertinent to the matter in hand. The litigation in the court is, we imagine, of a sufficiently general nature, and in any case it is no question of establishing the court. The court is already established, and Parliament has declared in the clearest possible manner that it is entitled to have the benefit of the High Court procedure. It is difficult to conceive what justification the Lord Chancellor has for the high-handed manner in which he appears to be preventing the wishes of the Legislature from being carried into effect.

A READING OF THE NEW STATUTES.

THE CREMATION ACT, 1902 (2 ED. 7, c. 8).

CONSIDERING that it is less than twenty years since it was argued that cremation was a criminal offence, the success of the advocates of the practice has been rapid, and the result appears in the general approval given to it by the Legislature in the present statute. The question of the legality at common law of disposing of dead bodies by burning was, it will be remembered, exhaustively considered by STEPHEN, J., in *The Queen* v. *Price* (12 Q. B. D. 247). There the method adopted was somewhat crude. The defendant had taken the body of a five-months-old child to a field of his own, some distance from any town, had put it into a cask of petroleum, and had set the petroleum on fire. A crowd interfered and prevented the body from being consumed, and PRICE was charged with a criminal offence and put upon his trial. The learned judge had some difficulty in finding any guidance in the authorities as to the legality of burning a dead body. He got what help he could, and it was not much, from the Anatomy Act of 1832 (2 & 3 Wul. 4, c. 75). The preamble of the Act contemplated that there might be a "legal supply" of human bodies for anatomical examination, and this, said STEPHEN, J., was inconsistent with the opinion that it was an absolute duty on the part of persons in charge of dead bodies to bury them. But as to whether, in default of burial, they might be burned, the law was silent. In mediæval England the question had not required to be discussed. Mr. Justice STEPHEN declined, under these circumstances, to create a new criminal offence unless the practice could be described as grossly scandalous, or highly mischievous, and it was neither. "Whether decay or fire," he said, on the authority of LUCAN, "consumes corpses matters not. The difference between the two processes is only that one is quick, the other slow. Each is so horrible that every healthy imagination would turn away from its details; but the one or the other is inevitable, and each may be concealed from observation by proper precautions."

The Legislature has now interfered to secure that in all localities where it is desired proper means for carrying out cremation shall be available. After defining, by section 2, "burial authority" to mean "any burial board, any council, committee, or other local authority having the powers and duties of a burial board, and any local authority maintaining a cemetery under the Public Health (Interments) Act, 1879, or under any local Act," the Act enacts by section 4 that "the powers of a burial authority to provide and maintain burial grounds or cemeteries, or anything essential, ancillary, or incidental thereto, shall be deemed to extend to and include the provision and maintenance of crematoria." By section 2 the expression "crematorium" means "any building fitted with appliances for the purpose of burning human remains, and includes everything incidental or ancillary

thereto." But the general power conferred on burial authorities by section 4 is subject to the proviso that "no human remains shall be be burned in any such crematorium until the plans and site thereof have been approved of by the Local Government Board, and until the crematorium has been certified by the burial authority to the Secretary of State to be built in accordance with such plans, and properly equipped for the disposal of human remains by burning." Section 5 forbids the construction of a crematorium nearer to any dwelling-house than 200 yards, except with the consent in writing of the owner, lessee, and occupier, or within 50 yards of a public highway, or in the consecrated part of a burial ground. Section 7 provides for the making by the Secretary of State of regulations as to the maintenance and inspection of crematoria, and prescribing when they may be used, and directing the disposition or interment of the ashes, and the notices, certificates, and statutory declarations required before any burning, and also regulations as to registration of burnings. These regulations are to be laid before Parliament. From the date when such regulations come into force, any provisions of local and personal Acts for establishing crematoria are by virtue of section 14 to cease. Sections 8 and 9 provide penalties for offences, and empower the Local Government Board to authorize a table of the fees to be taken. Section 10 saves the jurisdiction of coroners, and declares that nothing in the Act shall authorize the burial authority or any person to create or permit a nuisance. This preserves the rule in *The Queen* v. *Price* (*supra*), that burning a dead body is a misdemeanour if it is so done as to amount to a public nuisance. And section 11 saves the consciences of incumbents who object to perform a funeral service in connection with cremation. The Act comes into operation in the 1st of April, 1903, after which date crematoria will not improbably be a usual addition to cemeteries.

REVIEWS.

WOLSTENHOLME'S PRECEDENTS.

FORMS AND PRECEDENTS ADAPTED FOR USE UNDER THE CONVEYANCING ACTS AND SETTLED LAND ACTS, 1881 to 1890. By EDWARD PARKER WOLSTENHOLME, M.A., Barrister-at-Law, one of the Conveyancing Counsel of the Court, and WALTER EVELYN CAPRON, LL.B., Barrister-at-Law. SIXTH EDITION. William Clowes & Sons (Limited).

The present edition of this valuable collection of precedents is noteworthy for the additions which have been made to the forms. Thus in the portion of the book relative to contracts for sale, there is inserted a very neat form of agreement for payment of purchase-money by instalments, to be used in connection with the conditions on a sale under the instalment system. In the special conditions of sale, the decision in *Re Duthy and Jesson's Contract* (1898, 1 Ch. 419), that on an open contract the vendor must bear the expense of obtaining title deeds required by the purchaser to be handed over on completion, although such title deeds are not in the vendor's possession, and are not referred to in the abstract, has suggested a special condition negativing this rule. There are also added a good condition for use on the sale of an equity of redemption and a similar condition on a sale under the court. Turning to the forms in mortgages we find that the now well-established device for obtaining by a vesting declaration the nominal reversion on a mortgage by demise has been incorporated, but neither in this form nor in others in the precedent books is any reference made to the making of a vesting declaration. No doubt it is considered that the power to appoint a new trustee implies the power to make a vesting declaration in the deed of appointment, but it seems better to refer to the latter power, especially as the clause in *London and County Bank* v. *Goddard* (1897, 1 Ch. 642) contained such a reference. *Rice* v. *Noakes & Co.* (1902, A. C. 24) has suggested the addition of a form of "tying covenant" during the continuance of the security on a mortgage of a public-house; and the very inconvenient decision in *Life Interest, &c., Corporation* v. *Hand-in-Hand, &c., Society* (1898, 2 Ch. 230) has led to the insertion of an excellently-framed proviso, at p. 77, for insertion in mortgages. There are also new forms of power to appoint a receiver extending to the appointment of a manager in cases where the goodwill of a business is included in a mortgage; of a proviso for the concurrence of a mortgagee in sales by the mortgagor and acceptance of the proceeds of sale in part discharge of the mortgage debt, and several other new forms for insertion in mortgages. We might go through the whole work in the same way and with much the same result; but we think we have said enough to shew that this new edition been very carefully revised with a view to meeting new difficulties and providing all the forms which the practitioner is likely to require. As regards terseness and aptness of expression we have always considered the settlement part of the book almost unrivalled, and in this part there is little, if any, change. We welcome the new edition as an eminently useful addition to the library of the conveyancer.

BANKRUPTCY.

THE PRINCIPLES OF BANKRUPTCY: EMBODYING THE BANKRUPTCY ACTS, 1883 AND 1890, AND THE LEADING CASES THEREON; PART OF THE DEBTORS ACT, 1869; THE BANKRUPTCY APPEALS (COUNTY COURTS) ACT, 1884; THE BANKRUPTCY (DISCHARGE AND CLOSURE) ACT 1887; THE PREFERENTIAL PAYMENTS IN BANKRUPTCY ACTS, 1888 AND 1897; THE LEADING CASES ON BILLS OF SALE. WITH AN APPENDIX CONTAINING THE SCHEDULES TO THE BANKRUPTCY ACT, 1883; THE BANKRUPTCY RULES, 1886, 1890, 1891, AND 1896; THE RULES AS TO THE COMMITTAL OF JUDGMENT DEBTORS, AND AS TO ADMINISTRATION ORDERS; REGULATIONS ISSUED BY THE BANKRUPTCY JUDGE; A SCALE OF COSTS, FEES, AND PERCENTAGES; THE BILLS OF SALE ACTS, 1878, 1882, 1890, AND 1891, AND THE RULES THEREUNDER; THE DEEDS OF ARRANGEMENT ACT, 1887, AND THE RULES THEREUNDER. By RICHARD RINGWOOD, M.A., Barrister-at-Law. EIGHTH EDITION. Stevens & Haynes.

Considering the quantity of matter which Mr. Ringwood describes on his title-page it must be admitted that he keeps his book within very moderate limits. Of the 400 pages or thereabouts that it contains, the first half are devoted to a statement of the principles of the law of bankruptcy, in the course of which the provisions of the Acts of 1883 and 1890 are set out; and the latter half gives in an appendix, in small but clear type, the rules and other matter required in practice. The statement of the law is concise, and the cases appear to have been accurately and successfully embodied. Thus the paragraph on the meaning of "void" in section 47 of the Bankruptcy Act, 1883, puts very clearly the series of decisions which culminated in the important ruling of the Court of Appeal in *Re Carter and Kenderdine's Contract* (45 W. R. 484; 1897, 1 Ch. 776), that settled property can be safely taken by a purchaser before the bankruptcy of the settlor has occurred. There is a full index, and the table of cases gives references to all the current reports. The book is clear in style and convenient in arrangement.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

A Guide to Criminal Law: Intended for the Use of Students for the Bar Final and for the Solicitors' Final Examinations. By CHARLES THWAITES, Solicitor, First in First Class Honours, June, 1880, &c. Sixth Edition. Geo. Barber.

Council of Legal Education Calendar, 1902.

CORRESPONDENCE.

SOLICITORS' GOWNS.

[*To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.*]

Sir,—Adverting to the question of the wearing of solicitors' gowns in county courts, which produced a paragraph in your valued journal, and is exercising the public mind at Brentford and elsewhere, it appears to me that probably there would not be very much objection on the part of solicitors to wearing the gowns and bands if there were some kind of distinctive headgear to go with them. This latter need not be essentially the same as the barristers'. By this means solicitors could then be distinguished from ushers and others who at present, to all appearance, wear similar gowns to those of solicitors.

I think it will be agreed that the wearing of robes by all advocates in the county courts adds to the dignity and solemnity of the proceedings.

CITY SOLICITOR.

Sept. 29.

NEW ORDERS, &c.

THE EXTRADITION ACTS, 1870 TO 1895.

At the Court at Balmoral, the 15th day of September, 1902.

Present, The King's Most Excellent Majesty, H.R.H. the Prince of Wales, Duke of Fife, Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas, Sir Dighton Probyn.

Whereas by the Extradition Acts, 1870 to 1895, it was amongst other things enacted that where an arrangement has been made with any foreign State with respect to the surrender to such State of any fugitive criminals, His Majesty may, by Order in Council, direct that the said Acts shall apply in the case of such foreign State; and that His Majesty may, by the same or any subsequent order, limit the operation of the order, and restrict the same to fugitive criminals who are in or suspected of being in the part of His Majesty's dominions specified in the order, and render the operation thereof subject to such conditions, exceptions, and qualifications as may be deemed expedient: And whereas a Treaty was concluded on the third day of December, one thousand eight hundred and seventy-three, between Her late Majesty Queen Victoria and his Majesty the Emperor of Austria and King of Hungary for the mutual extradition of fugitive criminals, in the case of which Treaty "The Extradition Act, 1870," was applied by Order in Council of the seventeenth March, one thousand eight hundred and seventy-four: And whereas a declaration was concluded on the twenty-sixth day of June, one thousand nine hundred and one,

between His Majesty and His Majesty the Emperor of Austria, King of Hungary, amending Article XI. of the said Treaty of the third of December, one thousand eight hundred and seventy-three, for the mutual extradition of fugitive criminals, which declaration is in the terms following:

As it is considered necessary by the Government of Great Britain and Ireland and by the Governments of Austria and Hungary to extend the period of fourteen days fixed in Article XI. of the Treaty for the mutual surrender of criminals, concluded on the 3rd December, 1873, between her late Majesty the Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, Empress of India, &c., on one side, and His Majesty the Emperor of Austria, King of Bohemia, &c., and Apostolic King of Hungary, on the other, the respective Plenipotentiaries, undersigned, have agreed that—

The last paragraph of Article XI. of the said Treaty of Extradition shall be altered as follows:—

"Provided, however, that he shall be discharged if, within the shortest time possible, and at the utmost within one month, a requisition for his surrender in accordance with the terms of Article IX. of this Treaty be not made by the Diplomatic Representative of the State which requests his extradition."

The present Declaration shall have the same force and duration as the Extradition Treaty of the 3rd of December, 1873, to which it relates.

The present Declaration shall be ratified, and the ratifications shall be exchanged as soon as possible at London.

In witness whereof the respective Plenipotentiaries have signed the same, and have affixed thereto the seal of the arms.

Done in duplicate at London, the 26th day of June, 1901.

For Great Britain and Ireland, His Britannic Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs,

(L.S.) LANSDOWNE.

For Austria and for Hungary, the Austro-Hungarian Ambassador,

(L.S.) DEYM.

And whereas the ratifications of the said Declaration were exchanged at London, on the twenty-fifth day of June, one thousand nine hundred and two: Now, therefore, His Majesty, by and with the advice of His Privy Council, and in virtue of the authority committed to him by the said recited Acts, doth order, and it is hereby ordered, that from and after the sixth day of October, one thousand nine hundred and two, the said Acts shall apply in the case of Austria and Hungary under and in accordance with the said Treaty as amended by the said declaration above set forth. Provided always that the operation of the said Acts shall be and remain suspended within the Dominion of Canada so long as an Act of the Parliament of Canada passed in one thousand eight hundred and eighty-six, and entitled "an Act respecting the Extradition of Fugitive Criminals," shall continue in force there, and no longer.

A. W. FITZ ROY.

LAW SOCIETIES.

THE INSTITUTE OF INTERNATIONAL LAW.

At the recent meeting at Brussels of this society, says a correspondent of the *Times*, the discussion of the question of international bankruptcy, upon which so much time has been spent, was resumed on the 22nd ult., and brought to a conclusion, for the present, the next morning. The task of M. Roguin, the reporter of the committee upon the subject, was no light one. For three days he has had to explain his proposals, and reply to a host of objectors, but he is rewarded by the provisional adoption with, of course, endless amendments, of most of the nineteen articles of his *règlement* on a subject of extreme complexity. Some of the articles *e.g.*, those dealing with preferred creditors, have been reserved for future consideration, and the text of the *règlement* is by no means finally settled; but there is no doubt that considerable progress has been made towards working out with the exceptions which are inevitable, a system which starts from the idea of a single bankruptcy for persons having relations with several states. This difficult topic of private international law has occupied the institute during most of the session, but the afternoons of the 22nd and 23rd ult. were devoted to a topic of public international law, and one of great practical interest: "The Treatment of Submarine Telegraphic Cables in Time of War." On this subject, which, it must be observed, was deliberately left untouched by the convention of 1884 for the protection of cables in time of peace, competitive sets of *thèses* were submitted by MM. de Bar and Holland, as well as papers of amendments in detail by MM. Renault, Den Beer Poortugael, and Perels. The rules eventually adopted followed, in the main, the lines indicated by Mr Holland, who was anxious to keep clear the two questions raised by the cutting of a cable—viz., as to the rights of neutrals to continued communication with belligerents, and the rights of the owners of the cable. The debates on the subject were very animated, and an active part was taken in them by MM. Fauchille, Lainé, Westlake, Pierantoni, E. Rolin, Descamps, and Strisower, as well as by the members already mentioned—M. Descamps wishing much to restrict, and MM. Renault and Perels to extend, the right to cut a cable connecting belligerent with neutral territory. There was also wide difference of opinion as to the analogies which might be taken as guides in dealing with cables; M. de Bar relying upon blockade and military occupation, Mr. Holland on the *jus angariæ* and the right of visit. Five rules on the subject were eventually voted dealing with the interruption of communications. It was found necessary to postpone the consideration of two other proposed rules dealing with the indemnity, if any, due to the owners of cables for interference with their property. The rules voted would in English run as follows:—

RULES RELATING TO SUBMARINE CABLES IN TIME OF WAR.

1. A submarine cable uniting two neutral territories is inviolable.

2. A cable uniting the territories of two belligerents, or two portions of the territory of one of the belligerents, may be cut anywhere, except in the territorial or neutralised waters appurtenant to a neutral territory ("neutralised" by treaty or by a declaration in conformity with Article 4 of the Resolutions of Paris of 1894).

3. A cable uniting a neutral territory to a territory belonging to one of the belligerents can in no case be cut in the territorial or neutralised (v. Article 2) waters appurtenant to neutral territory. On the high seas, such a cable cannot be cut unless in the case of an effective blockade, and within the limits of the blockade, subject to an obligation to re-establish the connection. The cable may always be cut on the territory, and in the territorial waters of the enemy, to a distance of three miles from low water mark.

4. It is understood that the liberty of a neutral State to transmit despatches does not imply a right of using the cable, or permitting it to be used, for rendering assistance to one of the belligerents.

5. With reference to the application of the preceding rules, no distinction is to be drawn between cables belonging to a State and those belonging to private individuals or companies, nor between cables which are the property of enemies and those belonging to neutrals.

When cable-cutting had been, for the present, disposed of, then commenced the "slaughter of the innocents," in the shape of reports of no less than six committees upon the various topics of public or private international law mentioned in the previous letter. Upon many of these not a little labour had been bestowed, and from one of them not a little amusement, as well as profit, had been expected. It proposed a body of thirty-two rules dealing with balloons, in time of peace and in time of war, suggesting a system of aerial police and *douane*, prescribing the registration of balloons, and deciding upon the nationality of children born on board of them. It was necessary to close the session, and it was agreed that the next shall take place in 1904, at Edinburgh. A principal task of the first meeting of the institute in Scotland will be to discuss the report of a committee which has just been appointed to draw up a manual of the law of neutrality.

THE GOWN QUESTION.

ON taking his seat at Brentford County Court on the 26th ult., his Honour Judge Snagge, K.C., according to the *Richmond and Twickenham Times*, said: Before proceeding with the ordinary business of the day, I wish to address a few words to the solicitors who usually practice in this court, and who have hitherto assisted me with ability, with unvarying courtesy, and in a manner the most orderly and decorous. Some people have lately been exercising their minds in discussing the powers of county court judges to impose upon unwilling solicitors the obligation of wearing gowns in court. The question may be of interest to some people, but it does not concern us at Brentford in the slightest degree, for I have never knowingly done anything of the kind, and have no intention of ever doing so. Nowhere, at Brentford or anywhere else, have I adopted that practice—though I believe it to be almost universal, and to be attended with many advantages—without previous inquiry as to the wishes of the general body of practitioners, and without having reason to believe that the practice would be agreeable to and welcomed by them. It has now been in existence here for nearly a year, and you all know how it has worked. You know that if the case of any unrobed advocate were called on, the worst that could happen would be its being passed over till he got a gown or borrowed one—a matter of not the slightest difficulty, and of frequent occurrence. You know that the case would then, on application made, be reinstated and heard, and that no loss beyond a brief delay could happen to any client whose advocate did not wilfully and wantonly refuse to comply with the easy practice of the court. However, I have seen it stated somewhere that the practice is not in favour with the solicitors of this court. I intend to test the correctness of this assertion, and should it turn out that the practice is in any way burdensome or inconvenient to you, or that it is for any other reason unwelcome to you, and you wish it abolished, it shall cease with the present sitting of the court. I have asked the registrar to try and find out with as much certainty as he can what your wishes are upon the matter, and I should be much obliged if you would make them known to him in writing. I attach no intrinsic importance to the question of robes, but I do attach importance to the orderly and decent conduct of business. So long as a rule on the subject exists, no fractious individual can be allowed to trample it under foot. In such an event the question would no longer be the trumpery one of gown or no gown; it would become the important one of order or disorder, of deference to or defiance of lawful authority, a question of the supreme importance of which those only can appreciate who have to administer the heavy business of a court like this. One word more. Whatever regulations for the orderly and decent conduct of business may for the future be in force in this court, if any person comes down here, and after being informed of their existence, will persist in setting them at defiance, and when reminded of the disciplinary powers of the court, will openly dare the court to exercise those powers, it will be an ill day for law and order and decency in Brentford when a judge can be found who will permit such an outrage to be permitted with impunity. It has occurred to me that I ought to remind you of at least one practical inconvenience which will result from the abolition of this present practice. Every presumption has hitherto, and naturally, been made in favour of a person who appeared in robes; it has been assumed that he was a duly qualified solicitor, and that he had complied with those statutory requirements as to the registrar's roll, without which he has no right of audience. No question has been asked of him, and no time has been lost in making inquiries. But no such presumption could safely be made in the case of every

ungowned stranger who comes here and says he is a solicitor. His name must, I suppose, be asked for and given in every case, the Law List will be in constant requisition, and frequent recourse must be made to the registrar's roll. Much valuable time will thus be lost in a court where every moment of our time is precious. This is no mere matter of etiquette, but one of very practical importance, which I trust you will not lose sight of when communicating your wishes to the registrar.

Mr. C. Robinson, the senior solicitor in court, said that when they heard of the rule they welcomed it as assisting the business and preventing mistakes arising from unqualified men posing as advocates. They had since found the rule to work well, and he personally trusted it would continue.

THE MILWARD CASE.

The surprise which was felt in Birmingham some three months ago when the unfortunate complications in the affairs of Messrs. Milward & Co., which eventually led to the bankruptcy of the firm, were first made public, was deepened in the city on Saturday, the 26th ult., says the *Birmingham Daily Post* (from which the following particulars are taken), when it became known that the senior partner, Mr. Robert Harding Milward, had been arrested on a charge of misappropriation of trust funds. For very many years the firm of Milward & Co. had occupied one of the foremost positions as solicitors in the Midlands. Professionally Mr. R. H. Milward, the head of the firm, was held in the highest esteem, and he was no less respected in private life. In Birmingham he was at one time a member of the City Council, and for years he was associated with its leading social and philanthropic movements, while in Worcestershire, where he was born and resided for the greater part of his life, he was actively identified for a considerable period with the public work of the county. In the practice of his profession he was the confidential legal adviser of many prominent county families as well as important business firms, and his extensive chamber work, which was of the highest class, was always regarded as being most lucrative. Few offices were better known in Birmingham than the large suite which Messrs. Milward & Co. occupied in Waterloo-street, and it was a great surprise to the public to learn in June last that the affairs of the firm were seriously embarrassed. It will be remembered that in the early part of June the trustees of the late Rev. George Inge applied to the Chancery Division for an order upon Mr. R. H. Milward, as the solicitor to the estate, for the payment of a very large sum of money which it was alleged was due to them. The order was made, and as it was not complied with, the trustees again appealed to the court, and Mr. Justice Farwell made an order of attachment against him. Mr. Milward intimated his intention to answer the writ, but the worry consequent on his troubles brought on a paralytic seizure, and he was unable to leave his room for several weeks. In the meantime an investigation of the affairs of the firm was commenced, but before it was completed a receiving order was made on the petition of a creditor, and in July Mr. R. H. Milward and his son and partner, Mr. John Henry Milward, were adjudicated bankrupts. On the institution of these proceedings the writ of attachment was withdrawn; but in August, on the application of the Incorporated Law Society the name of Mr. R. H. Milward was struck off the rolls (*ante*, p. 716) The first meeting of creditors was subsequently held, when the actual statement of affairs disclosed an estimated deficiency on the joint estate of £27,063, the liabilities being £91,653. Unsecured creditors were set down at £73,551, fully secured at £5,927, and partly secured at £28,302, the security for the latter being valued at £10,200. The principal assets were: Contingent interest in various undertakings, £44,750; shares and fourth debentures, £1,392; good book debts, £14 321; and surplus from securities in the hands of creditors fully secured, £3,500. The private estates each showed a surplus: Mr. R. H. Milward, £123; Mr. J. H. Milward, £94. The chief assets in the name of Mr. R. H. Milward were: Furniture, £2,500; and surplus of securities, £4,000; the heaviest liability being a deficiency of £5,656, after allowing £16,140 as the value of the security held by creditors partly secured. Briefly stated, the causes leading to the failure, as given by the debtors, were: "Heavy losses caused partly by Mr. R. H. Milward's late partner, Mr. Thomas Spencer, by whom he estimates he lost £40 000" When Messrs. R. H. and J. H. Milward appeared before Mr. Registrar Glaisyer at the Birmingham County Court for their public examination, nearly three weeks ago, an application by the official receiver (Mr. L. J. Sharp) for an adjournment was granted in order that the investigation of the affairs of the bankrupts might be completed, and the public examination was postponed until November. A warrant for the arrest of Mr. R. H. Milward was granted on Thursday in last week by the city stipendiary (Mr. T. M. Colmore) upon the information of the official receiver, and Mr. Milward was arrested on Saturday morning and brought to Birmingham. On arriving there he was placed in the dock. The magistrate on the bench was Mr. W. L. Powell. Detective superintendent Daniel, in answer to Mr. King (magistrate's clerk), produced the warrant on which he had apprehended the prisoner. Mr. King then read the charge, which stated that prisoner was sixty-four years of age, and of no profession. It read: "On the 22nd of June, 1901, having been entrusted as an attorney with the sum of £2,800 in money, being the moneys of Sir William Jaffray, Bart., Sir John Charles Holder, Bart., and Walter W. Wiggin, Esq., as the trustees and executors of the will of Sir John Jaffray, Bart., deceased, with a certain direction in writing to pay the said sum of money to the person specified in the said direction, unlawfully and in violation of good faith and contrary to the terms of the said direction did convert to his own use and benefit the said sum of money." Mr. King (magistrate's clerk), to the officer: Your application is for a remand? The Chief Constable: I ask for a remand until Thursday. This prosecution is in the hands of the Treasury. I have been in communication by telephone with their solicitor, who is out of town and cannot reach here. He has asked me to apply for a remand until Thursday. Mr. King (to prisoner): Have you any reason to give why you should not be remanded? Prisoner: I have to ask for bail. The Magistrate: You will be remanded until Thursday. I do not feel that I can take the responsibility of granting bail, Mr. Milward. It will be refused. Prisoner: Do I understand that you refuse bail? The Magistrate: Yes. Prisoner: It is very unusual to refuse bail in these circumstances. The Magistrate: I do not think so, according to my experience. You may renew your application for bail when the case comes on again next Thursday. Prisoner: That means that I am to be kept in custody from now until that day. It is a gross condition of things. I am prepared with substantial bail. The Magistrate: What has the prosecution to say? Mr. Luke J. Sharp (official receiver): I have to say, and I do so with much regret, that the charge is of a serious nature, and that other charges are to be preferred. The Magistrate: What has the Chief of Police to say? The Chief Constable: Unless I have instructions to the contrary from the Treasury I must oppose the application. The Magistrate: Under the circumstances I cannot take the responsibility of granting bail. Mr. King: You may, of course, if you think fit, take a shorter remand with a view to another application being made. The Chief Constable: If necessary you can make the remand until next Monday, when Mr. Rowlands (the Treasury solicitor) can be present. The Official Receiver: If the remand is until Monday a further remand must be given. We are not prepared to go on with the case at present. Mr. King: The only object of the remand will be to give the prisoner an opportunity to make application for bail. The Official Receiver: My counsel is not here, as the notice was so short. Mr. Parfitt is retained by the Treasury to conduct the case. Prisoner: The law presumes that I am innocent; therefore I am entitled to ask for bail and to press for bail. I am in the position to give the most substantial bail that can be asked. The Magistrate: I will alter the remand until Monday, when you can then renew your application. On Monday Mr. Milward was again brought up before Mr Colmore, the stipendiary magistrate. Mr. Parfitt having informed the stipendiary that he had been instructed by the Treasury to prosecute, observed that the case came before the court on Saturday, and that bail was refused. An adjournment was, however, granted in order that the matter might be further considered. Counsel asked for a formal remand until Thursday, when he would apply for a further remand for a week. His hope was that the prosecution would then be able to go thoroughly into the case. The Stipendiary: It is a clear understanding that you are not going on with it on Thursday next? Mr. Parfitt: The intention of the prosecution is to go on with the charges on the 9th of October. That date, I understand, suits everybody. Mr. Hazell applied for bail. He took it that the only object of refusal of bail would be to prevent the possibility of a person putting himself out of the reach of justice. In the present case there was not the slightest possibility of that taking place. Mr. Milward had consented to an adjudication in bankruptcy, well knowing that the result would be strict investigation into his affairs. The official receiver in bankruptcy had throughout been in possession of the various addresses at which the accused had lived during the time the proceedings had been in progress. If there had been the slightest desire on his part to put himself out of the reach of justice he might have done so some time ago. He had, however, remained at hand ready at any time to answer any charges which might be brought against him. The stipendiary was aware of something of the character of the charges made, and counsel submitted that it was very necessary in the interests of the prosecution, the defence, and the prisoner himself, that his own personal attention should be given to the matter. If his defence were not to be prejudiced—and he (Mr. Hazell) was sure that was the last thing the bench would wish—it was necessary that the accused should be able to give full help to his advisers. He was able to offer substantial bail, with sureties whose credit was unimpeachable. The Stipendiary: He was arrested on one specific charge of misappropriating £2,800. Is it to be understood that the Treasury will institute other charges? Mr. Parfitt said that there would be two more charges—three altogether. The Public Prosecutor considered that it was essentially a case in which proceedings should be taken. So far as the prosecution had been able to ascertain, a sum of something like £11,000 was involved in that charge and the two others which it was proposed to prefer against the prisoner. The charges against him were of a most serious character, and involved large amounts. Mr. Milward's position was well known, and he (counsel) was not going to suggest that he was a gentleman who would play fast and loose with the court. It was, however, a purely hypothetical question, and he asked the stipendiary to consider whether bail should be granted. But if bail were allowed he asked that it should be fixed at such a substantial amount as would, so far as they could see, make it certain that the accused would turn up to answer the charges. The Stipendiary: I cannot grant bail until I know what those charges mentioned by Mr. Parfitt are. I must refuse bail. Mr. Hazell: Will it be allowable to make another application when the other charges which have been vaguely hinted at are formulated? The Stipendiary: You can, of course, apply for bail at any time, but if the charges are as serious as Mr. Parfitt puts it, I do not think it is a case in which I can grant bail.

The following remarkable advertisement has appeared in the *Times*: Aged solicitor holding valuable records of large estate in central England, should communicate with G. G. W., No. 2, Montague-place, Russell-square, before October 3rd.

CONCERNING PROFESSIONAL CRIMINALS.

SIR ROBERT ANDERSON has an interesting article on this subject in the *Nineteenth Century* for October. In the course of the article, which will well repay perusal, he says: The crime articles which I have been permitted to contribute to the pages of this review have in some quarters been described as "an agitation." It is unusual, in England at least, for an agitation to receive so soon and so signally the highest official approval. The following is an extract from the *Times* report of the summer assizes: it is culled from the paper of the 12th of July. "Mr. Justice Phillimore, in the course of his charge to the grand jury at Maidstone, said that the calendar was remarkable for the number of charges of burglary and robbery with violence which it contained It would perhaps be found, when the cases came to be examined, that the persons charged with burglary were old offenders. How such persons should be punished was a question which had recently attracted considerable attention. Sir Robert Anderson had written several interesting articles on the subject since his retirement, and the matter had been brought before the judges of the King's Bench Division by one of the oldest, the most experienced, and the most humane of their number. The result had been that communications had passed between the Home Office and the judges with the view of ascertaining whether it would not be possible to devise some new form of detention more or less permanent, but slighter in its incidence, than penal servitude, by which old offenders might be restrained from preying upon the public It was constantly necessary for judges to pass sentence upon prisoners as to whom it was certain that when their term of imprisonment was over they would renew their old dishonest life. Such unhappy people were the despair of the judges, the police, and all reforming agencies. It would be well if, in the interest of the public, some scheme such as that which he had indicated could be elaborated without undue cruelty." The particular *projet de loi* which the judges have thus adopted is that to which I gave prominence in my article of last December, viz.: that, with a view to the adequate protection of the community, the courts should be empowered to pass sentences for prolonged terms that would not entail the cast-iron severity of our present prison discipline. In this matter, as also in respect of the other reforms I have advocated, I make no claim to originality. On the contrary, I have done little more than formulate views which are held by all who are in a position to understand the problems involved. I am all the more anxious therefore that no prejudice should be caused by misconceptions or misrepresentations of the changes proposed, or of the grounds on which I urge them. I beg permission, therefore, to restate them, with some important modifications, the outcome of further thought and fuller discussion with persons specially fitted to advise upon questions of the kind. But, first, as to what I have *not* said. Our English newspapers are happily free from the reproach which rests upon the press of certain foreign countries: they are incapable of deliberately misleading the public, even on the smallest matters. But in the rush and scramble of press work inaccuracy prevails, and a telling paragraph in one journal is reproduced by others. It has thus come about that a number of the provincial papers gave currency to the report that in my judgment there are but seventy professional criminals in this country. This was a gloss upon a statement contained in my December article. In dealing with the possible objection to my scheme, that the number of criminals who would need to be permanently incarcerated would be so great as to render it unworkable, I referred to a popular advertisement about "70,000 thieves known to the police." My immediate subject, as stated on the very same page, was *organised* crimes against property; and my words were "that if, not 70,000, but seventy known criminals were put out of the way, the whole *organisation* of crime against property in England would be dislocated." I will only add that, if Scotland Yard to-day could supply a list of seventy criminals who have both the means and the ability to organise crimes of this class, my retirement from office must have been followed by an extraordinary development either of crime or else of the knowledge of criminals by the police. I am told that in the city a few well-known men are responsible for the entire system of fraudulent company promoting, by which the public are systematically swindled. And certain it is that a few well-known criminals are responsible for the bulk of the *organised* crimes against property. In my first article of this series, which appeared in February last year, I referred to them as "the *élite* of the criminal profession," and I added, "Such men live well. They can name their favourite wine, and they know a good cigar. A trip to Brighton is an ordinary incident in their easy lives; and a winter visit to Monte Carlo is nothing out of the way. They are responsible for the elaborate frauds, the great forgeries, and bank robberies which now and then startle the public." Some years ago a doctor friend of mine, who has a large practice in one of the suburbs, spoke to me about a mysterious patient of his. Now and then he hastened to the man's house in response to an urgent message asking for his immediate attendance; but, though he always found him in bed, he never could discover anything serious the matter with him. This, however, was scarcely a grievance from a doctor's point of view, especially as the patient was rich, and always paid his account with commendable promptitude. But a strange incident had recently occurred. When, in compliance with a summons more urgent even than usual, my friend hurriedly entered his patient's room, the man sprang up in the bed and covered him with a revolver. As a matter of fact, this seemingly eccentric individual was one of the criminals I am alluding to. He it was who stole the famous Gainsborough picture, which Mr. Agnew recovered in such a dramatic manner. The doctor's visits were designed to support an *alibi* in the event of his being accused of complicity with any of the crimes he directed. If, for example, a police officer should swear that the man was seen with a fellow criminal, say at twelve o'clock on a certain day, his doctor could testify that an hour later on that very day he found him still in bed. The man lived in luxury, though he never did an honest day's work in his life. I know of crimes his "earnings" from which, taken together, amounted to very large sums; in one case they were reckoned by tens of thousands of pounds. At one time he kept a steam yacht. He was not only a master in planning a great crime, but he was in a position to choose suitable lieutenants to carry it out, and also to supply them with the necessary funds. Such men, of course, are few in number, and they are so well known that their names might be included in a statute of outlawry. And if reason and common sense were allowed a hearing in such matters, this would be an admirable method of dealing with them. But what is our present method? If and when they are brought to justice they are "punished" for the particular crime charged against them by a few years' imprisonment, and then turned out again to plan new crimes Men of this type are the aristocracy of crime. We next come to the professional classes generally. The distinction between the professional criminal and the occasional criminal is well known to all who have to do with crime. "There are two classes of burglars," said Mr. Montagu Williams (the words are the opening sentence of the eleventh chapter of his *Round London*), "those who dabble in crime, breaking into houses when their funds are low; and those who make it the serious business of their lives." And by "professional criminals" I mean those who make crime "the serious business of their lives." And here several questions claim consideration. Can such criminals be clearly distinguished? Are they numerous? Are our present methods of dealing with them adequate? And if not, how should they be treated? As regards the first two questions, people must be guided by those who have practical knowledge of criminals. And their testimony is explicit and emphatic. There is no difficulty in ascertaining whether a man is a criminal in the sense that he has committed a crime or crimes, or a criminal in the deeper sense that crime is his regular occupation and habit. Indeed, the inquiry involved is one of the simplest that a competent police force has to undertake. I will not attempt to estimate statistically the volume of professional crime. Two facts are certain, and nothing more is needed for the purpose in hand. First, the professionals are numerous enough to keep the inhabitants of our large cities in a state of siege; and, secondly, they are not so numerous as to make the task of dealing with them an impracticable one. For as I have repeatedly explained, the "habitual criminals," so-called, registered at Scotland Yard under the Prevention of Crimes Act, are not necessarily persons who live in and by crime. That register of course includes most of our professional criminals, but it includes also a greater number who are "habitual criminals" only in a statutory sense. That this distinction should be so generally overlooked is not surprising, for it is absolutely ignored by the law. The law declares that any one who has been in certain circumstances twice convicted of crime is an habitual criminal; and the maintenance of this legal fiction operates to hurt a casual offender, and also to shield the criminal who is a *real* "habitual." As a matter of fact the law does not recognize the existence of criminals of this class, albeit they are such an important factor in the practical problem of crime. And now I appeal to an intelligent public to consider these facts; first, that we have in our midst a considerable number of persons who of set purpose live by crime; and, second, that the law at present fails to provide means to protect society from their depredations. In proof of the first, I appeal to the united testimony of judges, magistrates, prison and police officials, and practical philanthropists who seek to help our criminals. Here, *e.g.*, is an extract from Mr. Justice Wills's letter to the *Times* of the 21st of February, 1901. After alluding to ordinary criminals, he went on to write as follows: "But there are others who follow crime as the business of their lives, who take it as a profession, who calculate and accept its risks, who have entirely ceased to work (if they ever did work), and never mean to do so. Such men are really hopeless. No punishment will alter them, and the moment they are released they begin to practise crime again. They are teachers of crime both by precept and example, and their exploits often throw a kind of halo of romance over crime, which does infinite mischief." Of these professionals some are men of ability and strength of character, while others are of exceptionally weak nature But while this distinction should be taken into account in settling details of prison discipline, it is of no importance here. What alone concerns us at this stage is the fact that criminals of this class abound, and that their existence is now ignored by the law; for, as I have explained in previous articles, under our present system the punishment of crime, and not the protection of society, is the main principle which governs the administration of the criminal law. Or if the criminal is considered, as distinguished from the crime, this is strictly limited by the Prevention of Crimes Act. And the anomaly and resulting mischief cannot but be intensified by every improvement in identifying criminals. Increased facilities for proving that an accused person is an habitual criminal in the statutory sense will serve to check the searching inquiry necessary to ascertain whether he is a "professional," or merely an occasional committer of crime. . . . It may be objected that deprivation of liberty is in itself a punishment, and a punishment of a very drastic character. Yes, but it is a punishment of the kind which, in the moral government of the world, men bring upon themselves, as distinguished from punishments which are inflicted upon them under some definite award. The case is somewhat parallel to that of a man who does a wrongful act which leads to his being convicted and sentenced, and also to his losing a position of emolument. The loss of his position may be the severest element in his "punishment"; but this is a natural and necessary consequence of his act, and he has only himself to blame for it. And this leads me to say that on one important point I differ, though with great respect, from Mr. Justice Wills. "Such men are really hopeless," he declares; "no punishment will alter them." That

the professionals include many who really cannot abstain from criminal acts I firmly believe. And our present system is brutal in its operation upon wretched creatures of this class. The old law which sent them to the gallows was really more merciful. They are moral lunatics, and as such they ought to be treated. But by far the most troublesome and dangerous criminals are of a wholly different type. As Sir Alfred truly says, in following crime as a profession, they "calculate and accept its risks." Let the risks be so increased as to make them really deterrent, and the calculating process will have a different result. Police efficiency has done a good deal to this end. It would do much more were it not that the general decrease in crime has operated so to lessen the penalties of crime that the law is no longer a terror to bold and adventurous spirits. In the book already quoted, Montagu Williams remarks that "a great many burglars carry firearms, but they rarely use them"; and from this he rightly argues that they are restrained by the fear of consequences. He might have added that if many burglars are careful to abstain from carrying fire arms, it is from the same cause. For some men a life of idleness and adventure, with plenty to eat and drink, has such a fascination that the chance of a five years' sentence will not deter them from following it. But let them know with certainty that a conviction will end their career and they will refuse such a risk altogether. Many of these men are by no means hopeless; and if the law were made 'a terror to evildoers,' they would abstain from crime. But nowadays, because there are fewer criminals than formerly, those who persist in crime enjoy an immunity which is a positive incentive to crime. This is due to two causes. First, as already explained, the law does not recognize *habitual* criminals, except in the statutory sense; and, secondly, the humanitarian folk are the patrons of these scoundrels; and even if a strong judge uses to the full the powers now allowed him by the law, the moral effect of his sentence is too often destroyed by the action of these agitators. It is important, therefore, to educate public opinion on the subject.

LEGAL NEWS.

CHANGES IN PARTNERSHIPS.

DISSOLUTION.

ALFRED TAYLOR and JOHN ANLABY MEADMORE, solicitors (Taylor Son, & Meadmore), 19, Old Burlington-street, London. Sept. 2. The said John Anlaby Meadmore will continue the said business in his own name. [*Gazette*, Sept. 30.

GENERAL.

The salaries and retiring annuities of judges of the High Court of Appeal for the year ended March last are stated to have amounted to £173,427—an increase of £2,656 over the previous year.

Mr. Justice Wright has fixed the following commission days for holding the ensuing autumn assizes on the Western Circuit—viz., Salisbury, Saturday, October 25; Dorchester, Thursday, October 30; Taunton, Monday, November 3; Bodmin, Saturday, November 8; Exeter, Thursday, November 13; Winchester, Wednesday, November 19; Bristol, Thursday, November 27.

An American judge, says the *Globe*, looked over his spectacles at the prisoner: "Have you anything to say before sentence is passed?" "Yes," answered the prisoner, pleadingly; "I venture to express the aspiration that your honour will graciously deduct from the term of my imprisonment the time occupied by my counsel's speech." And he yawned wearily.

It is announced that the work of the Royal Commission on martial law in South Africa is practically finished, as there are very few cases to be inquired into at Pietermaritzburg; and that the members of the Commission will proceed by steamer to Cape Town, and after spending two more days there will leave for England on the 8th of October. Their report will not be drawn up until their return to England.

Lord Alverstone, says "South Africa," while on the *Carisbrook Castle* bound for the Cape, took part in a "Trial by Jury," appearing for plaintiff in the breach of promise action "Farnham *v.* Orr." His lordship opened his case with a modest apology that, owing to the absence of another counsel, his fair client was to be so unworthily represented by himself. He could hardly have expected the patronising remark of the presiding judge, "Oh, doubtless you will do your best."

Sir Robert Finlay was on Wednesday presented with the freedom of the Royal burgh of Nairn, in the neighbourhood of which he has his residence. The ceremony was held in the presence of a large and representative assembly of the district. The resolution of the town council stated that the honour was conferred in recognition of Sir Robert's eminence as a lawyer, of the distinction with which he had served the State as Solicitor-General for England from 1895 to 1900, and as Attorney-General since 1900, and of the invaluable services he had rendered to the community as its Parliamentary representative, and also in promoting numerous local schemes for the public welfare. The Provost of Nairn, in presenting the burgess ticket, said that Sir Robert Finlay came to Nairn in 1885, a stranger and an untried man, and now he was a citizen of the burgh and the accomplished Attorney-General.

The death is announced of Mr. Horace Gray, late a justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, within little more than three weeks after his retirement. In 1854 he was appointed reporter of the decisions of the Supreme Court of Massachusetts, and ten years later an Associate Justice of the same court. He became Chief Justice in September, 1873. As a judge he gained a reputation as an authority upon all matters relating to constitutional law, and those which concern chartered rights. In December, 1881, he was appointed an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. He was, says a correspondent of the *Times*, large and powerfully built, and had a strong face full of character and determination. He maintained the dignity of the court in a high sense. He kept himself absolutely aloof from partizan politics from the earliest days of his judicial career in his own State.

In a suit relating to brewery property, says the American *Case and Comment*, an eminent and very dignified counsellor was one day reading to the court some manuscript affidavits which were not over legible, and by mistake read the word "mash" as "wash." Counsel on the other side, who was small of stature and polite in manner, but keen in intellect and sarcastic, was immediately on his feet, and with a somewhat irritating deference of manner, begging his opponent's pardon, &c., asked liberty to suggest that the word which the eminent counsellor read "wash" was really "mash." Somewhat nettled, the counsellor thus corrected thanked him for the information, and added that he was not himself very familiar with terms used in the brewery business, as he had never spent much of his time in a place of that kind. "Are we to understand then," said his opponent in his suavest manner, "that the eminent counsellor wishes us to infer that his early days were spent in a laundry?"

Mr. Tankerville Chamberlayne writes to the *Times* as follows: "In the year 1895 a young man named Frank Miles was sentenced to death for the murder of his wife at Norwich. The circumstances were briefly these: Miles had borne an excellent character, but unfortunately he married a woman whose temper and morals made his life miserable Again and again did he do his best to reform her, but in vain, and one day, when goaded almost to madness by her conduct and language, in a moment of ungovernable passion he stabbed her, and her death was the result. Immediately after the sentence was pronounced two petitions, one signed by 15,000 people in Norfolk, and the other by 14,500 inhabitants of Southampton, his native town, were forwarded to the Home Secretary, and I called attention to the case in the House of Commons. The sentence was then commuted into one of penal servitude for life. Just recently, at my request, the late Home Secretary kindly undertook to reconsider the case, with the result, however, that he felt bound to decline to advise any further leniency. Not many days after I received his letter one Herbert Dickson was tried at the Old Bailey for what was called the 'manslaughter' of his wife. It appeared his was a sad story of domestic unhappiness caused by the wife's conduct and unfaithfulness, and one day, when upbraiding her for her perfidy, he became so exasperated at her language that in a fit of fury he seized a knife and cut her throat. The judge, in passing sentence, which was six months' imprisonment in the second division, declared his sympathy with the prisoner and almost apologized for having to punish him at all. There is, however, one point of difference in these two cases—Dickson had threatened his wife if he found she continued her misconduct, but Miles's crime was entirely unpremeditated." Mr. Percy J H Robinson, Dickson's solicitor, has since written to explain that "there was no evidence that his crime was premeditated, as Mr. Chamberlayne's letter would seem to suggest. The true facts are that at the time the crime was committed Dickson was not merely upbraiding his wife for her conduct, but urging her to turn over a new leaf and be true to him, whereupon his wife said she had ceased to care for him and would do as she liked, using words which clearly meant that she would commit adultery; then it was that in a moment of frenzy Dickson said she should not live another day with the man referred to, and seized a knife and cut her throat. A great portion of the evidence was of such a painful and unpleasant character as to render it almost unfit for publication; but if Mr. Chamberlayne had heard this evidence I think he would have agreed with the learned judge and with the grand jury, that not only was the crime entirely unpremeditated, but that it was committed under such dreadful provocation as to reduce the offence to manslaughter."

The following letter has been addressed by a parish council to the President of the Local Government Board: "I am directed to call your attention to the inconvenience occasioned by the Local Government Act, 1894, in compelling country parishes to elect the same person as Poor Law guardian and rural district councillor. As you are aware, the duties of the two offices are dissimilar, and the necessary qualifications by no means always exist in the same individual. It is, in the opinion of this council, undesirable that country parishes should be permanently deprived of the right of free choice which they possessed under the old law when electing to the offices of Poor Law guardian and waywarden. It is true that prior to the Local Government Act, 1894, the Poor Law guardian undertook the sanitary work as well as the Poor Law work, but he at all events had not the burden of the highway work as well. Even then, however, it was beginning to be found that the sanitary work demanded more time than the average Poor Law guardian could willingly spend upon it. The sanitary work of country parishes is increasing year by year, and now that highway matters can no longer be looked after by a separate representative many rural district councillors have more than they can properly attend to. Moreover, this Act causes friction, by leaving only one elective office of consequence to be filled in most parishes. In this particular parish, when the new Act came into force, an election ensued because the Poor Law guardian did not wish to give up his duties, neither did the waywarden wish to give up his, although neither of them had the least desire to perform the duties formerly discharged to the satisfaction of the parish by the other. In the next parish to this the Act in question compels a lady to undertake the highway and sanitary work rather than relinquish the work of a Poor Law guardian, for which she is well qualified, and in which she takes a great interest. It seems to this council that a continuation of this

compulsion is not in the best interests of rural parishes, and is just as undesirable as it would be if the inhabitants of boroughs were compelled to elect the same persons both as town councillors and Poor Law guardians. This council therefore hopes that a short Act may be passed to remove the grievance which the Act of 1894 has imposed. No separate expenses of election need be incurred, as different coloured ballot papers could be used, as already is the case where the elections for rural district councillors and parish councillors are held simultaneously." The following reply has been received: "I am directed by the Local Government Board to advert to your letter of the 22nd ult., suggesting an amendment of section 24 (3) of the Local Government Act, 1894, so as to remove the necessity for the offices of guardian and district councillor of a rural parish being vested in the same person. The President recognizes that the existing system may on occasion be open to the disadvantage to which your letter refers, but at the same time he has no evidence of any general demand for a change in the law on the subject. He has, however, directed that the representation which you have made shall be noted for consideration."

WARNING TO INTENDING HOUSE PURCHASERS AND LESSEES.—Before purchasing or renting a house, even for a short occupation, it is advisable to have the Drains and Sanitary Arrangements independently Tested and Reported upon. For terms apply to The Sanitary Engineering Co. (H. Carter, C.E., Manager), 65, Victoria-street, Westminster. Established 27 years. Telegrams: Sanitation, London. Telephone: 316 Westminster.—[ADVT.]

THE PROPERTY MART

SALES OF THE ENSUING WEEK.

Oct. 6.—Messrs. JENKINS & SONS, at the Mart, at 2: Freehold Premises known as Nos. 7 and 8, Laurence Pountney-lane, Cannon-street E.C. Solicitors, Messrs. Benwell & Norfolk, London. (See advertisement, Sept 27, p. 4)

Oct. 9.—Messrs. STIMSON & SONS, at the Mart, at 2:—Peckham: Nine Freehold Peppercorn Ground rents secured upon 44 houses, with reversion in 1969 to 1972 to the rack-rents, estimated at £1,200 per annum. Solicitors, Messrs Pollock & Co., London.—Walworth: Freehold Ground-rent of £12 12s., secured upon two houses, with reversion to the rack-rents of about £75 per annum. Solicitors, Messrs. Brooks & Heller, London.—Freehold Premises belonging to and in the occupation of the Royal Asylum for the Deaf and Dumb Poor, Old Kent-road, covering an area of about 18,500 feet super. Solicitors, Messrs. Hughes, Hooker, & Co., London. (See advertisements, Sept 27, p. 8.)

RESULT OF SALE.

Messrs H. E FOSTER & CRANFIELD held their usual fortnightly Periodical Sale at the Mart, on Thursday last, when all the Lots offered, with one exception, found purchasers, the total realized being £9,885. The following are the prices realized:—

		£
ABSOLUTE REVERSIONS:		
To a sum of £3 80	Sold	2,450
To a seventh of £36,724 18s. 9d. India 3½ per cent. Stock	,,	3 400
To £2 180 3 per cent Local Loan Stock	,,	1,715
£600 3 per cent. Local Loan Stock in possession	,,	465
Manor of Frees	,,	340
RENT-CHARGES:		
Of £40 per annum	,,	900
Of £33 1s. 11d. per annum	,,	615

WINDING UP NOTICES.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, Sept. 26.

JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

BARNETT WOOD BRICK WORKS, LIMITED (IN LIQUIDATION)—Creditors are required, on or before Oct 29, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to F. G. Sharpe, 27, Walbrook

G. H MORTON & CO, LIMITED (IN LIQUIDATION)—Creditors are required, on or before Oct 25, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their claims, to David Williams, 191, Queen Victoria st

HULL WOOL WASHING CO, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before Oct 27, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to James Crake, 3, Parliament st, Kingston upon Hull Iveson & West, Hull, solors for liquidator

RAILWAY EQUIPMENT AND CONSTRUCTION CO, LIMITED (IN LIQUIDATION)—Creditors are required on or before Nov 1, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Samuel Peck, Hamilton House, Victoria Embankment

SOUTHBOURNE, BOSCOMBE, AND BOURNEMOUTH OMNIBUS CO LIMITED—Creditors are required on or before Nov 8 to send in their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Arthur Williams, Metropole chmbrs, Bournemouth. Decker & Turner, Bournemouth, solors for liquidator

ST. BEDE TRADING CO, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before Oct 31, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Thomas Bowden, 42 Mosley st, Newcastle upon Tyne

VOSPERTON GOLD MINES, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before Nov 6, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Augustus Cecil Weller, 9, Fenchurch st

WIGTON MARKET HOUSE CO, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before Nov 5, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Samuel Rigg, Wigton. Rigg, Wigton, solor to liquidator

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, Sept. 30.

JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

CHELTENHAM COLLEGE BOARDING HOUSES CO, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before Nov 8 to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to James Batten Winterbotham and William Read Porcher, care of Tichhurst & Co, Cheltenham, solors to liquidators

COBURNA WATERWORKS CO, LIMITED—Petn for winding up, presented Sept 25, directed to be heard Oct 28 Sugden & Barfield, 10, Ironmonger la, solors for petnr. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of Oct 27

COTTINGHAM GAS CO, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before Nov 8 to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Rollit & Sons, Cogan House, Hull

DOVER ATHLETIC GROUND, LIMITED (IN VOLUNTARY LIQUIDATION)—Creditors are required, on or before Nov 6, to send their names and addresses, and particulars of their debts or claims, to Arthur James Worsfold, 3, Market sq, Dover

LINCOLNSHIRE FLAX AND HEMP CO, LIMITED (IN LIQUIDATION)—All persons having any claims are required to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Joseph Fresh, Crowle, Brewer's Manager. Burtonshaw & Kendall, Crowle, solors to liquidators

LONDON UNITED TRAMWAYS CO, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before Nov 11, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Samuel White, Clare st House, Clare st, Bristol. Stanley & Co, Bristol, solors to liquidator

NEW LIGHT CO LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before Oct 31, to send their names and addresses and the particulars of their debts or claims, to G H Tyler, 58, New st, Birmingham Shakespeare, Birmingham, solor

NORTHERN BUNGALOWS LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before Nov 1, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Dickinson & Co, Grainger st West, Newcastle upon Tyne, solors to liquidator

NORTHERN BUNGALOW CYCLING CLUB, LIMITED Creditors are required, on or before Nov 1, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Dickinson & Co, Newcastle upon Tyne, solors for liquidator

NORTH OF ENGLAND PLATE GLASS INSURANCE CO. LIMITED—Petn for winding up, presented Sept 24, directed to be heard before the Court sitting at Newcastle upon Tyne, Oct 16. Mather & Dickinson, Mosley st, Newcastle upon Tyne, solors. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of Oct 15

PACIFIC ISLANDS CO, LIMITED (IN LIQUIDATION)—Creditors are required, on or before Nov 20, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Henry Crowdson Howard, 17, Coleman st. Ashurst & Co, 17, Throgmorton av, solors for liquidator

CREDITORS' NOTICES.

UNDER 22 & 23 VICT. CAP. 35.

LAST DAY OF CLAIM.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, Sept 19.

ADAMSON, JOHN, Tunbridge Wells Nov 1 Maitlands & Co, Knightrider st, Doctors' Commons

ALDRIDGE, GEORGE, Clapham, Licensed Victualler Nov 30 Chandler, New ct, Lincoln's inn

ARMSTRONG, EMILY HANNAH, Bexhill on Sea Oct 21 Brennan & Brennan, Maidstone

BASE, GEORGE, Catton, Norfolk, Hardware Merchant Oct 31 Culley, Norwich

BEAR, TOM DREW, Ealing Oct 20 Woosnam & Smith, Chancery la

BELLOWS, JOHN THOMAS, Upton Knoll, nr Gloucester, Printer Oct 11 Bellows & Co, Gloucester

BINNING, REBECCA Newport Mon Oct 30 Llewellyn, Newport, Mon

BLOOM, SUSANNAH Old Kent rd Oct 18 Synnot, Manningtree

BRANSON, CHARLES, Osgathorpe, Leicester Oct 31 Dean & Son, Loughborough

BRETSCH, HARRIET, Wilmot cres Oct 24 Gateley & Son, Birmingham

BUCKINGHAM, ALFRED Hailey, Oxford, Farmer Nov 3 Westell & Son, Witney, Oxon

CLOUGH, ALFRED Middlesbrough, Clothier Oct 15 Dawes, Middlesbrough

CORDWELL, BENJAMIN, Kentish Town Oct 17 Bisdell & Thompson, Jermyn st, St James's

COUSINS, CHARLES MURRAY LUGGER, Tunbridge Wells Oct 30 Crundall & Co, Cannon st

DALTON, WILLIAM, Croston, Lancs, Farmer Nov 1 Smith, Southport

DAWKINS, EDWARD CHARLES HONEYWOOD, S Iverton, Devon Oct 25 Dowson & Co, Surrey st, Victoria Embankment

EDWARDS, GEORGE CANNING, Stratford Dec 1 Hillearys, Fenchurch bldgs

ELDER, CAROLINE MATILDA, Norwich Oct 18 Hill, Norwich

GOTHARD, FRANCIS SHERWIN, Croydon Oct 18 Saunders, Croydon

GREEN, GEORGE Reading, Rate Collector Oct 16 Martin & Martin, Reading

GREGG, WILLIAM Liverpool Oct 29 Lee, Liverpool

HAINE, JAMES, Deptford Oct 15 Turner, Fore st

HARDY, JOHN, Bradford, Miner Oct 20 Perkins Bradford

HARRISON, JOHN, Youlgreave, Derby Oct 31 F & H Taylor, Bakewell

HARTLEY, ISAAC, Springside nr Todmorden, Fisher Nov 1 Sutcliffes, Hebden Bridge

HEWETT, LOUISA Witney, Oxford Nov 3 Westell & Son, Witney

HOOPER, CHARLES, Barnsbury rd, Islington, Laundryman Oct 6 Clarke & Co, Islington

HUDSON, EDMUND HENRY SELFE, Wayndiete Ross, Hereford Oct 20 Rawlinson, Bedford row

JAMES, THOMAS MORGAN, Kensington Gardens ter, Hyde Park, Surveyor Sept 30 James & Thomas, Swansea

KEMP, DAVID, Blackpool, Cotton Manufacturer Oct 30 Ascroft, Blackpool

KEYMER, EDWARD For st Gate Oct 28 Vos, Bethnal Green rd

MARTIN, WILLIAM FREDERICK, Ringmer, Sussex Oct 31 Martin, Ringmer, nr Lewes

MASON, MARY HARRIETT, Holloway Oct 30 Algar, Abchurch la

MITCHELL, REBECCA, Heeley, Sheffield Oct 31 Webster & Styring, Sheffield

PEACE, HENRY HORTON, Penistone, Yorks, Commercial Traveller Oct 25 Dransfield & Hodgkinson, Penistone

PEACOCK, OWEN WEBB, Forest Gate, Tailor Oct 31 Southgate & Rawson, Ironmonger la Cheapside

PHILIP, GEORGE, Liverpool Nov 5 Andrews & Co, Essex st Strand

PICKING, CHARLES GORDON, Bounds Green rd, Middlesex Oct 30 Keen & Co, Knightrider st

POOLE, ELIZABETH, Ryde, I of W Nov 1 Ratcliffe, Ryde

POVAH, CHARLES, Upton, nr Macclesfield, Insurance Actuary Nov 1 Pointon, Birmingham

SHERWOOD, GEORGE, Offenham, Worcester, Yeoman Oct 20 Wagstaff, Pershore

SMYTH, GEORGE EDWIN, Bootle, Lancs, Chemist's Manager Oct 29 Quiggin & Brothers, Liverpool

STOKE, CHARLES MARTIN, Peckham Nov 5 Russell & Co, Norfolk st, Strand

SUTTON, AMBROSE THOMAS, Leytonstone Oct 31 Ellis & Co, College hill

SWEET, EDWARD, Nottingham, Undertaker Oct 20 Fraser, Nottingham

SYKES, ANN, Ravenscraft park, Hammersmith Oct 11 Marshall & Co, Hammersmith

TAYLOR, FREDERICK, Westcombe park Oct 30 Lithgow, Wimpole st

TAYLOR, JOSEPH LEIGH, Newton Heath, Manchester Nov 1 W R & P S Minor, Manchester

TOWLER, JOHN BLAND Kirton Lindsey, Lincs, Farmer Oct 18 Walker & Co, Spilsby

TRAVELL, ELIZA, Nottingham Oct 20 Travell, Nottingham

WETHERALL, KATHARINE Addlestone, Surrey Oct 18 Guedalla & Cross, Old Broad st

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, Sept. 23.

ANDREWS, GEORGE EDWARD GENGE, Rimpton, Somerset Nov 11 Marsh & Warry, Yeovil

BARLOW, EDWARD HOOPER, Chorlton cum Hardy, nr Manchester Nov 29 Walker & Co, Manchester

BAYLISS, WILLIAM DANIEL, Clevedon, Somerset Nov 6 O'Donoghue & Co, Bristol

BEAUMONT, AMOS, Rishworth, nr Halifax, Insurance Agent Oct 21 Godfrey & Co, Halifax

BELL, CHARLES, Dunnington common, York, Yeoman Nov 28 Nicholson & Brown, York

BUTLER, JAMES, Southfields, Surrey Oct 21 Furber & Dickinson, Gray's inn sq

CHAPMAN, WILLIAM, Blackfriars, Jeweller Oct 31 Attenborough, Piccadilly

DAVISON, THOMAS FRANCIS, Cheapside, Jeweller Oct 31 Attenborough, Piccadilly

DEAN, MARIAN, Shepherds Bush Nov 1 Homewood, Old Jewry chmbrs

DE GROOT, FREDERICK, South Twickenham, Auctioneer Oct 30 Senior & Furbank, Richmond, Surrey

DICKINSON, GEORGE, Sons, Yorks Oct 27 Iveson & West, Hull

ELLIOTT, PHILIP JOHN PERRY, Clifton, Bristol Oct 24 Isbell, Bristol

GOLLEDGE, WILLIAM, Wimborne Minster, Dorset Nov 6 Lovell & Co, Gray's inn sq

GRAY, ELIZA, Clapham Oct 27 Grant & Co, Strand

GRAY, WILLIAM, Clapham Oct 27 Grant & Co, Strand

HEDDEN, WILLIAM, Scarborough Nov 5 Turnbull & Son, Scarborough

HEWITT, ROBERT DAWSON, West Middlesbrough, Merchant Tailor Oct 18 Dawes, Middlesbrough

KEELING, JANE, Hanley Oct 25 Sword & Son, Hanley

KEBBY, MARIA, King's Heath Oct 18 Gem & Co, Birmingham

LYALL, JAMES WATSON, Pall Mall Nov 6 Meredith & Co, New sq, Lincoln's inn

MARSDEN, MARGERY, Southport Oct 25 Graham, Wigan

MATTERSON, EDWARD HARDWICK, Dewsbury Nov 1 Chadwick & Sons, Dewsbury
MURCHISON HARRIET ISABELLA, Gt Cumberland pl Nov 6 Hastie Lincoln's inn fields
REAY, JOSEPH Westbourne Park Oct 31 Potter & Co King st Cheapside
SMITH, ISABELLA Patrick Grompton Yorks Oct 21 Maughan, Middleham, R S O
STEINMANN, PAUL CLAUDIUS, Piccadilly, Lace Merchant Oct 31 Attenborough, Piccadilly
TODD, JOHN AUTON, Stockton on Tees Oct 29 Langley, Stockton on Tees
WAINWRIGHT, JOSEPH, Handsworth, Jeweller Oct 27 Glaisyer & Co, Birmingham
WILDY, LOUIS, West Hampstead Oct 31 Orgill, Lincoln's inn fields

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, Sept. 26.

ADAMS, JAMES THOMAS, Wells, Somerset Oct 27 Stone & Co Bath
BAGULEY, HENRY, Holland st, Southwark, Builder Nov 24 Keene & Co, Scething la
BALL, THOMAS, Oundle, Northampton, Butcher Oct 23 Sturton, Peterborough
BEARNE, SARAH, Torquay Oct 23 Kitsons & Co, Torquay
BROWN, ANN, Clifton, Glos Nov 7 Farrer & Co, Manchester
COATES, JOSEPH Littleport, Cambs. Vestry Clerk Oct 25 Hall, Ely
DANIEL, JOHN York, Oct 25 Isle, York
DEARLOVE, THOMAS, Killinghall, York, Farmer Oct 10 Hirst & Capes, Harrogate
DOODY, FRANCES, Pokesdown, Bournemouth, Oct 30 Ballard, Bournemouth
EMMERSON, HENRY WILLIAM, Albert terr, Lambeth Dec 1 Taylor & Taylor, New Broad st
FORSYTH HARRIET, Barnes Oct 27 Morley & Co, Old Broad st
GOODFIELD, ROBERT SALOMS, Cardiff, Milk Merchant Oct 30 Thomas & Francis, Cardiff
GROVE, FLORENCE CRAUFURD, Palace st, Buckingham Gate Nov 15 Hills & Halsey, Lincoln's inn fields
GUISE, JULIA, Meole Brace, nr Shrewsbury, Salop Oct 27 How & Son, Shrewsbury
HARE, FANNY, Wimbledon Nov 6 Hargreave & Heaton, Birmingham
HASTWELL, MARGARET, Burnley Oct 24 Whittingham, Burnley
HEATON, MARION Catford, Kent Nov 21 Reed & Co, Gt St Thomas Apostle
HILL FREDERICK, Bury Oct 31 Howarth Bury
HOOK WILLIAM EDWARD, Northfield, Worcester Oct 14 Whitehouse & Stoddart, Birmingham
HORNCASTLE WILLIAM GEORGE jun, Bruton st, Bond st Oct 25 Rawlings & Butt, Wimbrook
KEYTE, WILLIAM jun, Stourton, Warwick, Brewer's Traveller Oct 30 Hancock & Co, Shipston on Stour
LEEFE, MARIA, Wheelton, Durham Oct 31 Leefe & Leefe, Quality ct, Chancery la
LUCAS, WILLIAM HARRINGTON, Sparkbrook, Birmingham Oct 20 G S & H Brandon, Essex st Strand
MILLNS JOHN, Boston Oct 31 Staniland, Boston
MOULD, HENRY, Hanley, Insurance Agent Oct 31 Boulton, Burslem
NICHOLSON, GEORGE, Pile Manufacturer Howford, nr Hexham, Northumberland Oct 31 Blackburn & Main, Carlisle
NORTON WILLIAM, Daventon, Machinist Nov 1 Corbett, Daventon
PARKER LYSIMACHUS, Horncastle, Lincoln Oct 30 Tweed & Overton, Horncastle
PRYKE, WILLIAM, Greenfield, Shrewsbury Oct 23 Sprott & Morris, Shrewsbury
PYKE, JOSEPH, Marylebone rd Oct 25 Cox & Lafone, Tower Royal, Cannon st
SMITH, OSWALD AUGUSTUS, Lombard st, Banker Nov 1 Freshfields, Old Jewry
STEWART ISAAC, Millfield, Durham, Tinsmith Nov 3 Legge & Miller, Houghton le Spring
STRICKLAND EDMUND, Southport, Surgeon Nov 3 Humphreys & Co, Halifax
TAYLOR, THOMAS Pokesdown, Hants Oct 22 Poole & Boulting, Taunton
TODD GEORGIANA Dymchurch, Kent Nov 1 Wyman & Wyman, Ludlow, Salop
TOPP SARAH, Weymouth Oct 30 Andrews & Co, Dorchester
TOWLER, JOHN BLAND, Kirton Lindsey, Lincoln, Farmer Oct 18 Walker & Co, Spilsby
TURNER, HENRY, Rotherfield, Sussex Nov 15 Cripps & Co, Tunbridge Wells
WRIGHT, SARAH ANN, Clayton, nr Bradford Oct 30 Wright & Co Bradford
WYNNE, Rev EDWARD, Haxby Vicarage, York Nov 18 Nicholson & Brown, York

BANKRUPTCY NOTICES.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, Sept. 23.

RECEIVING ORDERS.

ALFORD, WILLIAM, Swindon, Railway Agent Swindon Pet Sept 22 Ord Sept 22
AITCHISON & Co, GEORGE, Manchester, Yarn Merchants Manchester Pet Aug 18 Ord Sept 24
RAGE, THOMAS WILLIAM, Bingley, Plumber Bradford Pet Sept 24 Ord Sept 24
BETTESWORTH, ROBERT EDWARD, Swanmore, Hants, Grocer Southampton Pet Sept 11 Ord Sept 24
BLYTH ALBERT EDWARD, Gt Yarmouth, Boot Maker Gt Yarmouth Pet Sept 23 Ord Sept 23
BLYTH, AUGUSTINE HENRY, Leamington, Horse Dealer Warwick Pet Sept 24 Ord Sept 24
CARLING, WILLIAM FREDERICK, Bristol, Commercial Traveller Bristol Pet Sept 22 Ord Sept 22
CHOLERTON, THOMAS JACKSON, Hastings, Tailor Hastings Pet Sept 24 Ord Sept 24
COUPLAND, JOHN, Withington, Commercial Traveller Manchester Pet Sept 23 Ord Sept 23
DILLISTONE, FRANK WILLIAM, Canterbury, Jeweller Canterbury Pet Sept 24 Ord Sept 24
FRANKLIN, WALTER EDWIN, Tiddington, Oxford, Farmer Aylesbury Pet Sept 23 Ord Sept 23
GLITHERO, SAMUEL, Aberystwyth, Licensed Victualler Aberystwyth Pet Sept 23 Ord Sept 23
HALSTEAD, BINGLEY, Ryhill, Yorks, Wheelwright Barnsley Pet Sept 23 Ord Sept 23
HARRIS, WILLIAM HORSPOOL, Shipley, Fried Fish Dealer Bradford Pet Sept 22 Ord Sept 22
HOGG, JOHN, New Yeat, Castlesowerby, Cumberland, Farmer Carlisle Pet Sept 24 Ord Sept 24
HUNT, ALFRED, Bolsover, Derby, General Shopkeeper Chesterfield Pet Sept 24 Ord Sept 24
HUNTER, ALBERT HENRY, Nantwich, Livery Stable Keeper Crewe Pet Sept 23 Ord Sept 23
JACKSON, THOMAS HUDSON, Grundy st, Poplar, Builder High Court Pet Sept 22 Ord Sept 22
LEIBBRAND, CHARLES HERMANN, Cloveley rd, Hornsey, Author High Court Pet Aug 6 Ord Sept 24
LINTOTT, CHARLES, Upper Norwood, Butcher Croydon Pet Sept 19 Ord Sept 19
LLOYD, RICHARD THOMAS, Coventry, Baker Coventry Pet Sept 22 Ord Sept 22
MALTON, JOSEPH jun, Pickering, York, General Dealer Scarborough Pet Sept 23 Ord Sept 23
MOSS, JOSEPH, Downham rd, Kingsland, Dealer in Fancy Goods High Court Pet Sept 23 Ord Sept 23
NELSON, PETER, Kingston upon Hull, Seaman Kingston upon Hull Pet Sept 23 Ord Sept 23
NEWING, GOLDEN EDWARD, Milford Haven, Grocer Pembroke Dock Pet Sept 22 Ord Sept 22
OATWAY, WILLIAM PALMER, Marston Magna, Somerset, Farmer Yeovil Pet Sept 23 Ord Sept 23
POWELL, ROBERT, Abergavenny, Cycle Repairer Tredegar Pet Sept 23 Ord Sept 23
ROBERTS, MARY, Bethesda, Carnarvon, Draper Bangor Pet Sept 24 Ord Sept 24
ROWLAND, CHARLES JOHN, Croydon Croydon Pet Sept 22 Ord Sept 22
SAUNDERS, ARTHUR DELACOURT, Poole, Builder Poole Pet Sept 23 Ord Sept 23
SMITH, WILLIAM HENRY, Malton, Yorks, Cycle Agent Scarborough Pet Sept 23 Ord Sept 23
TERRY, FRANK THOMAS, Rochester, Contractor Rochester Pet Sept 22 Ord Sept 23
THOMAS, F W, Wandsworth rd, Coal Merchant Wandsworth Pet Aug 28 Ord Sept 24
WALTON, GEORGE, Darlington, Blacksmith Stockton on Tees Pet Sept 23 Ord Sept 23
WARNHAM, ALBERT, Bury, General Dealer Bolton Pet Sept 23 Ord Sept 23
WATSON, JAMES HINDSON, Carlisle, Tobacconist Carlisle Pet Sept 23 Ord Sept 23
WHITAKER, S M, Minehead, Somerset Taunton Pet June 6 Ord Sept 23

FIRST MEETINGS.

BROOMS, JOB CROSLAND Derby, Baker Oct 3 at 11 Off Rec, 47, Full st, Derby
BULMER, ARTHUR GIBSON, Guisborough, Mineral Water Manufacturer Oct 3 at 11 Off Rec, 8, Albert rd, Middlesbrough
CALLAWAY, ALBERT HENRY, Stratford on Avon, Builder Oct 3 at 12 Off Rec, 17, Hertford st, Coventry
CAMERON, MATTHEW JAMES, Swindon, Wilts, Draper Oct 6 at 11.30 Off Rec, 38, Regent circus, Swindon
CLARKE, WILLIAM, Hinckley, Leicester, Baker Oct 3 at 3 Off Rec, 1 Berridge st, Leicester
COWLEY, DANIEL, Hove, Baker Oct 3 at 11.30 Off Rec, 4, Pavilion bldgs, Brighton
DAVIES, EDWARD JOSEPH, Cheshury Mortimer, Salop, Grocer Oct 3 at 3 Off Rec, 199, Wolverhampton st, Dudley
GRIMSHAW, WILLIAM, Prestwich, nr Manchester, Cycle Maker Oct 3 at 3 30 Off Rec, Byrom st, Manchester
HAIGH SON, Headingley, Leeds Dyer Oct 7 at 3 Off Rec, 22, Park row, Leeds
HARGREAVES WILLIAM THOMAS, Torrington sq Oct 8 at 11 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
HARRIES, DAVID, Aberdare, Grocer Oct 6 at 2.30 135, High st, Merthyr Tydfil
HARRIS, WILLIAM HORSPOOL, Shipley Fried Fish Dealer Oct 3 at 11 Off Rec 31, Manor row, Bradford
HOFFER, ADELAIDE ASHTON, Gower st, Fancy Sale Oct 9 at 11 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
HOLMSHAW, FRANK, Sheffield Confectioner Oct 7 at 12 Off Rec, Figtree la, Sheffield
HOWAN, HEBER JOB Rhyl, Flint, Fancy Dealer Oct 3 at 12 Crypt chmbrs, Eastgate row, Chester
HORSFALL, OLIVER, Filey, Yorks, Printer Oct 4 at 11 74, Newborough, Scarborough
HOWSE, WALTER Rushden, Northampton, Boot Manufacturer Oct 3 at 12 Off Rec, Bridge st, Northampton
JACKSON, GEORGE PATTINSON LISTER, and THOMAS CROWE, Haltwhistle, Northumberland Mineral Water Manufacturers Oct 8 at 3 Off Rec, 34, Fisher st, Carlisle
KETTERINGHAM, HARRY, Lowestoft, Jobmaster Oct 4 at 1 Off Rec 8, King st, Norwich
KROLL, MARKS High st, Poplar, Grocer Oct 6 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
LANDSTEIN, ADOLPH, Shirland rd, Paddington, Fine Art Dealer Oct 8 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
LLOYD, RICHARD THOMAS, Coventry, Baker Oct 3 at 11.30 Off Rec, 17, Hertford st, Coventry
MARRIOTT ERNEST WATSON, Hereford, Cycle Agent Oct 6 at 3 2, Offa st, Hereford
MINISTER, SAMUEL CLARENCE, Bradwell Castle, Suffolk Oct 4 at 1 30 Off Rec, 8, King st, Norwich
NICHOLS, DAVID, Rochdale, Tobacconist Oct 10 at 11.15 Townhall, Rochdale
PEEK, TOM, Hereford, Licensed Victualler Oct 6 at 3 2, Offa st, Hereford
RISK, RICHARD HUMPHREY, Manchester, Bag Manufacturer Oct 3 at 2.30 Off Rec, Byrom st, Manchester
ROBINSON, THOMAS GEORGE EDWARD, Kidderminster, Butcher Oct 3 at 3 30 Off Rec, 199, Wolverhampton st, Dudley
SCROGHAM, THOMAS PARKINSON, Brighton Oct 3 at 11 Off Rec, 4, Pavilion bldgs, Brighton
SMITH, WILLIAM THOMAS, Sheffield, Licensed Victualler Oct 7 at 12 30 Off Rec, Figtree la, Sheffield
STOKES, THOMAS, Derby, Tailor Oct 3 at 12 Off Rec, 47, Full st Derby
STUART HENRY PAICE Wandsworth, Licensed Victualler Oct 6 at 11.30 24, Railway app, London Bridge
TERRY, BANK THOMAS Rochester, Town Carter Oct 6 at 12.15 115, High st Rochester
TOMLINSON, JEROME Fleetwood, Lancs, Railway Guard Oct 3 at 11 30 Off Rec, 14 Chapel st Preston
TYLER, WILLIAM EDWARD Burton on Trent, Furniture Dealer Oct 3 at 12 30 Off Rec, 47, Full st, Derby
WATSON JAMES HINDSON, Carlisle, Confectioner Oct 8 at 3.30 Off Rec, 34, Fisher st, Carlisle
WILSON, JAMES Newcastle on Tyne Draper Oct 8 at 11.30 Off Rec, 30, Mosley st, Newcastle on Tyne
WINSTANLEY, EVELYN, West Hoathly, Sussex, Gardener Oct 3 at 12 Off Rec, 4, Pavilion bldgs Brighton
WRIGHT, JAMES, Sutton in Ashfield, Notts Miner Oct 3 at 11 Off Rec, 4, Castle pl, Park st, Nottingham

ADJUDICATIONS.

ALFORD, WILLIAM, Swindon, Railway Agent Swindon Pet Sept 22 Ord Sept 22
BAGE, THOMAS WILLIAM, Bingley, Yorks, Plumber Bradford Pet Sept 23 Ord Sept 23
BANNANT, THOMAS, Gt Yarmouth, Dealer Gt Yarmouth Pet Sept 23 Ord Sept 23
BARTLETT, ONESIMUS SMART, Paignton, Solicitor Plymouth Pet Aug 2 Ord Sept 23
BLYTH, ALBERT EDWARD, Gt Yarmouth, Boot Maker Gt Yarmouth Pet Sept 23 Ord Sept 23
BLYTH, AUGUSTINE HENRY, Leamington, Horse Dealer Warwick Pet Sept 24 Ord Sept 24
BRAMHALL ELLIS, jun, Brighton, Sussex, Circus Proprietor Brighton Pet Sept 26 Ord Sept 26
CALLAWAY ALBERT HENRY, Stratford on Avon, Builder Warwick Pet Aug 28 Ord Sept 24
CARLING, WILLIAM FREDERICK, Bristol, Commercial Traveller Bristol Pet Sept 22 Ord Sept 22
COUPLAND, JOHN Withington, Commercial Traveller Manchester Pet Sept 23 Ord Sept 23
COWLEY, DANIEL, Cowley Sussex, Baker Brighton Pet Sept 19 Ord Sept 24
CROSS, GEORGE, Upper Edmonton, Builder's Merchant Edmonton Pet July 31 Ord Sept 18
CURTIS WALTER VICKS, Birmingham, Butcher Birmingham Pet Sept 9 Ord Sept 23
HALSTEAD BINGLEY, Ryhill, Yorks, Wheelwright Barnsley Pet Sept 23 Ord Sept 23
HARRIS, WILLIAM HORSPOOL, Shipley, Yorks Fried Fish Dealer Bradford Pet Sept 22 Ord Sept 22
HOGG JOHN Castlesowerby, Cumberland, Farmer Carlisle Pet Sept 24 Ord Sept 24
HUNT ALFRED, Bolsover, General Shopkeeper Chesterfield Pet Sept 24 Ord Sept 24
HUNTER, ALBERT HENRY Nantwich Livery Stable Keeper Nantwich Pet Sept 23 Ord Sept 23
JACKSON THOMAS HUDSON, Poplar, Builder High Court Pet Sept 22 Ord Sept 22
KROLL, MARKS Poplar, Grocer High Court Pet Aug 18 Ord Sept 23
LLOYD, RICHARD THOMAS, Coventry, Baker Coventry Pet Sept 22 Ord Sept 22
MALTON JOSEPH, jun, Pickering York, General Dealer Scarborough Pet Sept 23 Ord Sept 23
MINISTER SAMUEL CLARENCE, Bradwell, Suffolk Gt Yarmouth Pet Sept 19 Ord Sept 23
MOSS, JOSEPH, Kingsland Dealer in Fancy Goods High Court Pet Sept 23 Ord Sept 23
NELSON, PETER Kingston upon Hull Seaman Kingston upon Hull Pet Sept 23 Ord Sept 23
NEWING, GOLDEN EDWARD, Milford Haven, Pembroke, Grocer Pembroke Dock Pet Sept 22 Ord Sept 22
OATWAY, WILLIAM PALMER, Marston Magna Somerset, Farmer Yeovil Pet Sept 23 Ord Sept 23
POWELL, ROBERT, Abergavenny, Cycle Repairer Tredegar Pet Sept 23 Ord Sept 23
RAWSON, ARTHUR, and JOHN CHARLES HUBBARD, Stoke Newington Cabinet Manufacturers Edmonton Pet Aug 7 Ord Sept 22
RICHARDSON, GEORGE ARTHUR, Bradford, Builders' Merchant Bradford Pet Sept 24 Ord Aug 28
ROBERTS, MARY, Bethesda, Draper Bangor Pet Sept 24 Ord Sept 24
SAUNDERS, ARTHUR DELACOURT, Lonefleet, Poole, Dorset, Builder Poole Pet Sept 23 Ord Sept 23
SMITH, WILLIAM HENRY, Malton, Yorks, Cycle Agent Scarborough Pet Sept 23 Ord Sept 23
TERRY, FRANK THOMAS, Rochester, Town Carter Rochester Pet Sept 23 Ord Sept 23
WALTON, GEORGE, Darlington, Blacksmith Stockton on Tees Pet Sept 23 Ord Sept 23
WARNHAM, ALBERT, Bury, General Dealer Bolton Pet Sept 23 Ord Sept 23
WATSON, JAMES HINDSON Carlisle, Tobacconist Carlisle Pet Sept 23 Ord Sept 23

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, Sept. 30

RECEIVING ORDERS.

ANTHONY, HENRY, Preston, Innkeeper Preston Pet Sept 26 Ord Sept 26
BAXENDALE, THOMAS, Bolton, Provision Dealer Bolton Pet Sept 26 Ord Sept 26
BENTLEY EDWARD, Kirkstall, Leeds Butcher Leeds Pet Sept 24 Ord Sept 26
BROWN ALBERT, Kingsthorpe, Glos, Innkeeper Gloucester Pet Sept 26 Ord Sept 26
CAVE, CHARLES, Leicester, Boot Manufacturer Leicester Pet Sept 25 Ord Sept 26
CAVILL, JOHN WILLIAM, Bramley, nr Rotherham, Yorks, Labourer Sheffield Pet Sept 25 Ord Sept 25
CLIFTON, WILLIAM JAMES, Oxford, Canal Office Clerk Oxford Pet Sept 5 Ord Sept 27
CRANAGE, HARRY, Headingley, Leeds, Mechanic Leeds Pet Sept 27 Ord Sept 27
DOMAN, WILLIAM HENRY, Oxford, Picture Frame Maker Oxford Pet Sept 27 Ord Sept 27
EBERY, HORACE, Newcastle under Lyme, Timber Dealer Stoke on Trent Pet Sept 2 Ord Sept

FINNERAN, JAMES, Gateshead, Grocer Newcastle on Tyne Pet Sept 25 Ord Sept 25

GARDAM, WILLIAM DENTON Kingston upon Hull, Teacher Kingston upon Hull Pet Sept 27 Ord Sept 27

GRIFFITH, J H B Brighton Brighton Pet July 22 Ord Sept 26

GROARKE, JOHN, Rochdale, Commission Agent Rochdale Pet Sept 6 Ord Sept 25

HARDMAN, JAMES, Burslem, Staffs High Court Pet Aug 20 Ord Sept 26

HARRIS, REUBEN, Birmingham, Brassfounder Birmingham Pet Sept 26 Ord Sept 26

HILL, JEREMIAH, Stourbridge, Ironplate Worker Stourbridge Pet Sept 24 Ord Sept 24

HOLMES, RICHARD OAKES, St Leonard's on Sea, Boarding house Keeper Hastings Pet Sept 25 Ord Sept 25

HUME, HENRY, Barnsbury, Milliner High Court Pet Sept 27 Ord Sept 27

JOHNSTONE, JOHN WILLIAM, Gt Grimsby, Fish Merchant Gt Grimsby Pet Sept 26 Ord Sept 26

JONES, JOHN WILLIAM, Whittington, Salop, Farmer Wrexham Pet Sept 25 Ord Sept 25

KENNELL, ROBERT North Wootton, Dorset, Carpenter Yeovil Pet Sept 27 Ord Sept 27

KNIGHT, J G, Uckfield High Court Pet Aug 29 Ord Sept 26

LEWIS DAVID Porth, Glam, Fish Dealer Pontypridd Pet Sept 24 Ord Sept 24

LIDDINGTON, ROBERT HENRY, Bicester, Oxford, Grocer Oxford Pet Sept 25 Ord Sept 25

MARTIN, JAMES, Brighton, Boarding house Keeper Brighton Ord Sept 25

MAUNDER, J B W, Broad st House High Court Pet July 22 Ord Sept 24

MELLOR JAMES, Birmingham, Dairyman Birmingham Pet Sept 26 Ord Sept 26

NEMROVSKY, JOSEPH MARKS, Birmingham Birmingham Pet Sept 3 Ord Sept 25

OFFER, THOMAS W, Shepherd's Bush, Grocer High Court Pet Sept 9 Ord Sept 26

PARR, GEORGE, Lowestoft, Carver Gt Yarmouth Pet Sept 27 Ord Sept 27

PIMM, CLEMENT PETERS, Eastbourne, Draper Eastbourne Pet Sept 27 Ord Sept 27

POTTER, JOSEPH Northampton, Ironfounder Northampton Pet Sept 26 Ord Sept 26

POWELL, AGNES E, Cardiff, Cycle Maker Cardiff Pet Aug 29 Ord Sept 22

READ, ABRAHAM, Blackpool, Plumber Preston Pet Sept 27 Ord Sept 27

REEVE, JAMES Redhill, Bootmaker Croydon Pet Sept 23 Ord Sept 23

RICH, JOHN, Cardiff, Wheelwright Cardiff Pet Sept 25 Ord Sept 25

RICHARDS, GEORGE FREDERICK, and ERNEST CHARLES DYNES, Leicester, Builders Leicester Pet Sept 24 Ord Sept 24

SHELTON, JOHN, Pontycymmer, Fruiterer Cardiff Pet Sept 26 Ord Sept 26

THOMPSON, WILLIAM, Wallsend, Coal Merchant Newcastle on Tyne Pet Sept 27 Ord Sept 27

THOULD, FREDERIC JOSEPH Wolverhampton, Grocer Wolverhampton Pet Sept 27 Ord Sept 27

WEBB, JOHN, Bury St Edmunds, Clothier Bury St Edmunds Pet Sept 13 Ord Sept 26

WHITLEY WILLIAM, Bradford Preston Pet Sept 9 Ord Sept 26

Amended notice substituted for that published in the London Gazette of Sept 26:

AITCHISON, GEORGE WILLIAM JOHN, Wilmslow, Cheshire, Yarn Merchant Manchester Pet Aug 18 Ord Sept 24

FIRST MEETINGS.

AITCHISON, GEORGE WILLIAM JOHN, Wilmslow, Cheshire, Yarn Merchant Oct 7 at 3 Off Rec, Byrom st, Manchester

ALFORD, WILLIAM, Swindon, Wilts, Railway Agent Oct 8 at 11 Off Rec 26, Regent circus, Swindon

BAGE, THOMAS WILLIAM, Bingley, Yorks, Plumber Oct 7 at 11 Off Rec, 31, Manor row, Bradford

BANNANT, THOMAS, Gt Yarmouth, Dealer Oct 10 at 12 Off Rec, 8, King st, Norwich

BETTESWORTH, ROBERT EDWARD, Swanmore Hants, Grocer Oct 14 at 3 Off Rec, 172, High st, Southampton

BLYTH, ALBERT EDWARD, Gt Yarmouth, Boot Maker Oct 10 at 12.30 Off Rec, 8, King st, Norwich

BLYTH, AUGUSTINE HENRY, Leamington, Horse Dealer Oct 7 at 11 Off Rec, 17, Hertford st, Coventry

BREWITT, WILLIAM HARRY, Lincs, Farmer Oct 9 at 12 Off Rec, 31, Silver st Lincoln

CARLISS, WILLIAM FREDERICK, Bristol, Commercial Traveller Oct 8 at 12 Off Rec, 26, Baldwin st, Bristol

CHAPMAN, LAURA, Shepton Mallet, Somerset Innkeeper Oct 8 at 11.30 Off Rec, 26 Baldwin st, Bristol

CHERRY, HENRY ERNEST, Walsall, Jobbing Carpenter Oct 8 at 11 174, Corporation st, Birmingham

CHOLERTON, THOMAS JACKSON, Hastings, Tailor Oct 7 at 3 County Court Office, 24, Cambridge rd, Hastings

CLARK, JAMES, Flookburgh, Cark in Cartmel, Farmer Oct 8 at 11.15 Off Rec, 16, Cornwallis st, Barrow in Furness

COUPLAND, JOHN, Withington, Lancs, Commercial Traveller Oct 8 at 2.30 Off Rec, Byrom st, Manchester

COUSINS, WILLIAM HENRY, Nantymoel, Newsagent Oct 9 at 12 Off Rec, 117, St Mary st, Cardiff

CURTIS, ANNIE ELIZABETH, Birmingham Oct 9 at 11.15 174, Corporation st, Birmingham

CURTIS, WALTER WICKS, Birmingham, Butcher Oct 9 at 11 174, Corporation st, Birmingham

DAVEY, GEORGE LEOPOLD, Cernydd Hendre, nr Penceed, Glam, Road Contractor Oct 9 at 11 Off Rec, 117, St Mary st Cardiff

DAWSON, JONAS, Malton, Yorks, Wine Merchant Oct 8 at 1 74 Newborough, Scarborough

DEAN-PITT, DOUGLAS CHARLES, Portsmouth Oct 7 at 3 Off Rec, Cambridge junc, High st, Portsmouth

DUNCAN, GEORGE THOMSON, Rangoon st, Tobacco Broker Oct 8 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st

HALSTEAD, BINGLEY, Ryhill, Yorks, Wheelwright Oct 7 at 10.15 Off Rec, Regent st, Barnsley

HOGG, JOHN, New Yeat, Castlesowerby, Cumberland, Farmer Oct 8 at 4 Off Rec, 34, Fisher st, Carlisle

HOLMES, RICHARD OAKES, St Leonards on Sea, Boarding house Keeper Oct 7 at 3.15 County Court Office, 24, Cambridge rd, Hastings

KNOWLES, JAMES, Manchester, Printer's Engineer Oct 8 at 3 Off Rec, Byrom st, Manchester

LINTOTT, CHARLES, Upper Norwood, Butcher Oct 8 at 12.30 24, Railway app, London Bridge

LIPPETT, JOHN DOUGLAS, Bedminster, Bristol, Butcher Oct 8 at 11.45 Off Rec, 26, Baldwin st, Bristol

MALTON, JOSEPH, jun, Pickering, Yorks, General Dealer Oct 8 at 11.30 74, Newborough, Scarborough

MANN, HENRY THOMAS WILLIAM, Llandyrnog, Denbigh Oct 31 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st

MARSHALL, THOMAS, Oldham, Furniture Dealer Oct 9 at 3 Off Rec, Greaves st, Oldham

MURRAY, EDWARD JOHN, Torquay, Photographer Oct 7 at 11 Off Rec, 13, Bedford circus, Exeter

NELSON, PETER Kingston on Hull, Seaman Oct 7 at 11 Off Rec, Trinity House ln, Hull

PEACOCK, LUKE and ARTHUR PEACOCK, Kingswood Glos, Boot Manufacturers Oct 8 at 11.15 Off Rec, 26, Baldwin st, Bristol

RAWSON, ARTHUR, and JOHN CHARLES HUBBARD, Stoke Newington, Cabinet Manufacturers Oct 7 at 12 Room 160, Temple chmbrs, Temple av

REED, WILLIAM, Balham Plumber Oct 9 at 12 24, Railway app, London Bridge

RICHARDS, GEORGE FREDERICK and ERNEST CHARLES DYNES, Leicester, Builders Oct 8 at 12 Off Rec, 1, Berridge st, Leicester

ROWLAND CHARLES JOHN, Bandon Hill, Croydon Oct 9 at 11.30 24, Railway app, London Bridge

SAUNDERS, ARTHUR DELACOURT Longfleet, Poole, Dorset, Builder Oct 8 at 11.30 Off Rec, Endless st, Salisbury

SMITH, WILLIAM HENRY Malton, Yorks, Auctioneer Oct 8 at 12 74, Newborough, Scarborough

STEPHENS, HERBERT, Handsworth, Commission Agent Oct 8 at 12 174, Corporation st, Birmingham

SWINGLER ELIZABETH, Boston, Lincs Oct 7 at 12.15 Off Rec 4 & 6, West st, Boston

TUPPER ERNEST DU SOLEI, Grainingfold, nr Billingshurst Sussex, Farmer Oct 7 at 2 King's Head Hotel, Horsham

WARNHAM, ALBERT Bury, General Dealer Oct 7 at 3 19, Exchange st Bolton

WOOD GEORGE, Hyde, Cheshire Oct 8 at 2.30 Off Rec, Byrom st, Manchester

WRIGHT, SAMUEL, Leicester Oct 7 at 3 Off Rec, 1, Berridge st, Leicester

Amended notice substituted for that published in the London Gazette of Sept 23:

DISDALE, WILLIAM, Gt Fransham, Norfolk, Farmer Oct 4 at 12 Off Rec, 8, King st, Norwich

ADJUDICATIONS.

AITCHISON, GEORGE WILLIAM JOHN, Wilmslow, Cheshire, Yarn Merchant Manchester Pet Aug 18 Ord Sept 27

ANTCLIFF, WILLIAM HENRY, Newark on Trent, Publican Nottingham Pet Sept 8 Ord Sept 26

ANTHONY, HENRY, Preston, Innkeeper Preston Pet Sept 26 Ord Sept 26

BAXENDALE, THOMAS, Bolton, Provision Dealer Bolton Pet Sept 26 Ord Sept 26

BENTLEY, EDWARD, Kirkstall, Leeds, Butcher Leeds Pet Sept 26 Ord Sept 26

BETTESWORTH, ROBERT EDWARD, Swanmore, Hants, Grocer Southampton Pet Sept 11 Ord Sept 26

BROWN, ALBERT, Kingstanley, Glos, Innkeeper Gloucester Pet Sept 26 Ord Sept 26

CAVILL, JOHN WILLIAM, Bramley, nr Rotherham, Yorks, Labourer Sheffield Pet Sept 25 Ord Sept 25

CHOLERTON, THOMAS JACKSON, Hastings, Tailor Hastings Pet Sept 24 Ord Sept 27

CRANAGE, HARRY, Headingley, Leeds, Mechanic Leeds Pet Sept 27 Ord Sept 27

EDGE JOSEPH, Wolstanton Hanley Pet Aug 1 Ord Sept 27

GARDAM, WILLIAM DENTON, Kingston upon Hull, Teacher Kingston upon Hull Pet Sept 27 Ord Sept 27

HILL, JEREMIAH, Stourbridge, Iron plate worker Stourbridge Pet Sept 24 Ord Sept 24

HOLMES, RICHARD OAKES, St Leonards on Sea, Boarding house Keeper Hastings Pet Sept 25 Ord Sept 25

JOHNSTONE, JOHN WILLIAM, Gt Grimsby, Fish Merchant Gt Grimsby Pet Sept 26 Ord Sept 26

JONES, ISABELLA WAYNE BURTON, Margate Canterbury Pet May 1 Ord Sept 20

JONES, JOHN WILLIAM, Whittington, Salop, Farmer Wrexham Pet Sept 25 Ord Sept 25

KENNELL, ROBERT, North Wootton, Dorset, Carpenter Yeovil Pet Sept 27 Ord Sept 27

KING, ARTHUR CLEMENT, Holland rd, Kensington, Cab Proprietor High Court Pet July 31 Ord Sept 24

LEWIS, DAVID, Porth, Glam, Fish Dealer Pontypridd Pet Sept 24 Ord Sept 24

LIDDINGTON, ROBERT HENRY, Bicester, Oxford, Grocer Oxford Pet Sept 25 Ord Sept 25

MANN, HENRY THOMAS WILLIAM, Llandyrnog, Denbigh High Court Pet Sept 2 Ord Sept 20

MELLOR, JAMES, Birmingham, Dairyman Birmingham Pet Sept 26 Ord Sept 26

PARR, GEORGE Lowestoft, Carver Gt Yarmouth Pet Sept 27 Ord Sept 27

PIMM, CLEMENT PETERS Eastbourne, Draper Eastbourne Pet Sept 27 Ord Sept 27

POTTER, ARTHUR, Edgware rd Greenwich Pet Aug 1 Ord Sept 26

POTTER JOSEPH, Northampton, Ironfounder Northampton Pet Sept 26 Ord Sept 26

READ, ABRAHAM, Blackpool, Plumber Preston Pet Sept 27 Ord Sept 27

RICH, JOHN, Cardiff, Wheelwright Cardiff Pet Sept 25 Ord Sept 25

RICHARDS, GEORGE FREDERICK, and ERNEST CHARLES LYNES, Leicester, Builders Leicester Pet Sept 24 Ord Sept 24

ROSSNER, CHARLES, Lorraine rd, Holloway High Court Pet July 3 Ord Sept 25

SCOTT JOHN THOMAS, Spennymoor, Durham, Grocer Durham Pet Aug 25 Ord Sept 26

SHELTON, JOHN, Pontycymmer, Fruiterer Cardiff Pet Sept 26 Ord Sept 26

SING, Prince VICTOR ALBERT JAY DULEEP, Hockwold Hall, Norfolk High Court Pet June 12 Ord Sept 26

THOMAS RHYS GORING, Copthall av, Solicitor High Court Pet July 12 Ord Sept 25

THOULD, FREDERIC JOSEPH, Wolverhampton, Grocer Wolverhampton Pet Sept 27 Ord Sept 27

WHITAKER, S M, Mitchcan Taunton Pet June 6 Ord Sept 26

MERRYWEATHERS'

COMBINATION OF APPARATUS FOR

FIRE PROTECTION,

ELECTRIC LIGHTING,

and WATER SUPPLY.

Three purposes provided for at One Minimum Cost.

Experienced Engineers sent to Survey at Mansions, Estates, and Villages.

MERRYWEATHERS' PORTABLE FIRE APPARATUS

FOR INDOOR PROTECTION.

"London Brigade" Hand Fire Pump - £5 5 0

(With which one person can attack a fire unaided, and by which the majority of the London fires which occur annually are extinguished)

"Chute" Fire Escapes, from - - £5 0 0

Hydrant Systems, from - - - £30 0 0

Pressure Augmenters for High Buildings where water service is at low pressure.

SPECIAL SPRINKLERS FOR LIFT SHAFTS.

Write for Pamphlets, post-free.

MERRYWEATHERS', 63, Long Acre, W.C., LONDON.

Where difficulty is experienced in procuring the SOLICITORS' JOURNAL *with regularity it is requested that application be made direct to the Publisher, at 27, Chancery-lane.*